THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
´CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/christianunionqu12unse

Jacobs #2

VOL. XII NO. 1

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

JULY, 1922

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

1499

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XII. JULY, 1922 No. 1

CONTENTS

FROM UNIFORMITY THROUGH DIVERSITIES TO COMPREHENSION 9
By Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., New Haven, Conn.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST AND THE KINGDOM 13
By Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D., Minister Central Church of Disciples, New York City.

A HALF-CENTURY EXPERIMENT IN INTERDENOMINATIONAL COÖPERATION AND ITS FAILURE 30
By Julia Pettee, New York City.

CHRISTIAN UNION—SOME OF THE GREATEST OBSTACLES 48
By Rev. J. H. Garrison, LL.D., Los Angeles, Calif.

APPROACHES BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN AND SWEDISH EPISCOPATES 60
By Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., Editor Christian Work, New York City.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY . 66

BOOK REVIEWS 77

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR APRIL, 1922

CHRISTIANS AND WAR 249
By Rev. Claudius B. Spencer, D.D., Editor The Central Christian Advocate, Kansas City, Mo.

SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR 266
By Rev. Francis Shunk Downs, Minister Market Square Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

REUNION 273
By Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, D.D., Bishop of San Francisco, Calif.

THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MOVEMENT AS A FACTOR IN INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP 284
By Rev. Francis Edward Clark, D.D., LL.D., Founder of the Christian Endeavor Movement.

THE LAMBETH PROPOSAL FOR PRACTICAL CHURCH UNITY 298
By Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., Congregational Church, New Haven, Conn.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 304

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 316

BOOK REVIEWS 318

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Washington, D. C., 1925. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1923 or 1924. Archbishop of Uppsala, president; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

A CHALLENGE TO PRAYER

The Act of Prayer

WORSHIP.

Realizing that we know very little about it, *let us ask*

For the spirit of worship;
For deep reverence and quietness;
For power to get away from ourselves altogether.

And, dwelling on God, let us give thanks

For His Reality;
For His Wonderful Love and Patience;
For His Gentleness;
For the Warmth and Tenderness and Humanity of His Heart;
For His Perfection;
For His Living Power.

WAITING.

Teach us how to wait on Thee, and for Thee. Give us power to wait steadfastly, and to receive whatever Thou dost give us. Help us to give ourselves up to Thee, as the only return we can make for Thy ceaseless love to us. Breathe into us Thy peace, and fill our lives with Thy power. Make us strong to endure, to suffer, to love, and to hope. Fill us with joyful confidence in Thy glorious sufficiency. Through Jesus Christ Our Lord, Amen.

INTERCESSION.

In our desire to help this distracted and suffering world, we need to *learn* to intercede.

Let us Pray

For the Holy Spirit's guidance in every part of our intercession;
For power to pray fruitfully for others;
For perseverance;
For willingness to enter into the secret of costly prayer;
For the love of Jesus Christ Himself in our hearts, constraining us to pray.

PRAYER

Saviour Divine . . . Grant unto us that we may share in Thy holy mystery of pain, Thy sacrament of agony, which redeemeth the world. Give us courage of heart, that we make drink with Thee a little of Thy cup. . . . Enoble us this day with a share in Thy work of redemption.

—*Prayers for Use in an Indian College.*

A PRAYER

O GOD, the enlightener of men, Who givest the Holy Spirit to all who ask Thee, hear us, we beseech Thee, and take from us the love of party, pride of denomination and the aloofness of sectarianism. Grant us the power to see Christ in all who have confessed Him, irrespective of party and creed. May we walk in the truth and be fellow workers for the truth, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE FELLOWSHIP

LAMBETH was right in stressing fellowship. For whatever may be the united Church, if God shall please to create it, it will be a fellowship. But how tragic it is that we are not to-day praying for and seeking, first of all, fellowship. We are studying and talking about and arguing over a hundred and one external expressions of fellowship such as creeds, church polity, the three orders of the ministry and prayer books. But these do not make a Church. The Church existed before any of them existed. When men were together, two or three or twenty, Christ in the midst of them creating fellowship, there we had a Church, a visible Church informed by the Spirit of fellowship.

—William Austin Smith in *The Churchman.*

A DIVINE IMPERATIVE

AS long as Christians regard Christian unity as a good thing, which we ought to have, it will never come. It has got to come into human conscience as a divine imperative. Christians must feel that woe is unto us if brotherhood is not observed by the whole world as the characteristic of Christian life and faith. Anything less than this is in the realm of the carnal life.

FROM UNIFORMITY THROUGH DIVERSITIES TO COMPREHENSION

Such both in the state and the church has been the progressive course of English and American history.

In 1566 Archbishop Parker's "Advertisements" of the Elizabethan policy of enforced uniformity marked the beginning of an age of conflict, persecutions, and separations.

In 1688, a hundred years and more later, the English Revolution was the beginning of a new age of toleration. There were then three main ecclesiastical divisions: within the Established Church there were the irreconcilables and the moderates, which later became known as the High and the Low Church parties; without were the dissenters. At that time two Acts were introduced in the Parliament of England,—An Act of Toleration and an Act of Comprehension. The Act of Toleration was passed; the Act of Comprehension was lost. The following period therefore may be characterized as the age of toleration. Throughout this period liberty was extended and dissenters were multiplied. The age of toleration has been prolific of sects.

The movement towards comprehension in English-American history has gone further and faster in the state than in the church. In America the several Colonies received their separate charters from the Crown. Self defense and other interests compelled them to become more closely associated. But it required the War of Independence to bring them together in a Federal Congress and on a constitutional basis. It required later the Civil War to prevent them from disintegrating into a Confederacy, and to become one and inseparably the United States of America.

But the churches still linger in what may be called the colonial period of their history. They have in recent years indeed become more closely federated, but not

organically united. Throughout this age of increasing sectarianism there have not failed to appear occasional prophets of an age to come, and apostles of reasonableness, of whom their times have not been worthy. As the evil of sectarianism became more and more revealed, the day of its judgment began to draw near. At first in the latter part of the nineteenth century various associations for the promotion of common Christian activities began here and there to appear; in 1905-1908 the Federal Council of the Churches was completely organized, and it has since continued, with increasing expansion of its agencies, its work of promoting Christian coöperation. The churches were becoming more and more confederated in Christian work, but not organically one in the fellowship of a common ministry and intercommunion of all believers.

A distinctive step towards more organic unity was taken by the Episcopal House of Bishops in the year 1886. They issued as a possible basis for reunion four proposals, which, as afterwards, approved with slight alterations by the ensuing Lambeth Conference, became known as the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. It called forth at once widespread discussion, which however died away towards the close of the century without producing practical results. A new spirit however was coming to its hour. The movement towards comprehension of diversities became more and more cumulative. In 1908 another Lambeth Conference sent out a call for mutual conferences for unity. A first response to it was made on this side of the ocean in the state of Connecticut by the annual Conference of Congregational Churches. A resolution to that effect passed by it was carried up to the following meeting of the National Council of the Congregational Churches, and a committee appointed to consider any further overtures from the Episcopal Church. This resolution was sent by telegraph to the

General Convention of the Episcopal Church then in session in another city, and a message from that body crossed it on the wires, announcing their action in calling for a World Conference as a first step towards unity. One after another different denominations appointed commissions in answer to it.

While this World Conference was being organized, suddenly, as a day of judgment from the Lord came the war. At once it called all churches out of their seclusions to engage altogether in an open field-fight for Christ's Christianity for the world.

As soon as possible another and epochal convention of the bishops of a great historic church assembled from all quarters of the world. By the war the providence of God had brought to its hour of judgment the inefficiency of a divided Christianity, and there has come forth from the suffering of the world One saying, Repent ye and believe the gospel for the kingdom of God is at hand. That call was heard, that presence seemed manifested in that Lambeth convocation. It was an epochal hour, when even to their own amazement, as though the very Spirit of the Lord had come upon them, with one voice and prayer they sent forth for all Christian people to hear their appeal for "a new adventure of faith."

Thus the ideal of the one church of Christ for the world has been brought down to us from a vision of some far off future, and put directly before us as the next practical thing to be done.

Such questions therefore as the following press for immediate answer.

1. What shall we do with this proposal?

2. Have we leaders in all the churches who have themselves felt the passion for unity?

3. What is being done to make the Lambeth Appeal known to the people? The people of the churches must render the final decision upon it.

4. What action upon it shall be taken at the coming meeting of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church next September?

5. The House of Bishops are authorized by their Rules of Order to resolve themselves into a Council of Bishops "for considering and acting upon matters of duty or responsibility resting on them as a portion of the universal episcopate." As such a body, beyond and above their diocesan obligations, shall they officially communicate to all other communions the Lambeth Appeal, with their own action upon it, and thus lay upon us also the responsibility of taking counsel together with them concerning it?

6. While no church should be expected to be submerged in any uniformity, should not any church be ready to be uplifted into a comprehension greater than itself?

7. Four centuries have waited for this day and this consummation. What longer can keep us from coming together?

NEWMAN SMYTH.

New Haven, Conn.

THE SOUL OF A GARDEN

Has not immortal life more wide extent
Than we, amid the shadows here, perceive?
This garden we have loved so long—I grieve
To part from it forever; it seems blent
Dear heart, with our life-story. God hath sent
His word so often by these flowers sweet.
God's love, your love, I found in this retreat;
Strength, solace in my sorrow, have been lent.

My love, when in some garden of the Lord
We waken at the dawning of the day,
Perhaps with joyful wonder, you and I
May find our tree and flower-friends restored,
And learn naught beautiful has passed away;
That things true love has hallowed cannot die.

—Maud Frazer Jackson.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST AND THE KINGDOM

Dr. James Moffatt, who has rendered such incalculable blessing to mankind by his translation of the New Testament which has made the Book a more human document and more intelligible, is now the guest of American Churches. He gave an address in New York City upon the day of his arrival. One paragraph of that first message of this gifted servant of the Kingdom should be pondered by every churchman in the world. He said in effect this: We can safely appraise the value of any movement or reformation in the Christian Church by two tests—(1) its ethical message to its age and (2) its hospitality toward new truth. Shall we make these tests our text in this hour while we think through the history of the Disciples and review their place in the midst of the currents that now move out deep and strong, toward that tidal sea of the love of God?

We are compelled under this test to keep the larger background of the Kingdom in mind if we are to arrive at any permanent finding which may be accepted by others than our own household of faith. Such a background is to be found in the most frequent word upon Jesus' lips, namely, "the Kingdom of God." Much as we hear and speak about the church we have little precedent for it in the ministry of Christ. Only twice did He mention the church, and one of these was but an incidental item in its relation to another subject. Familiar as this theme is to the present assembly it is always needful to check up on our emphasis. It is startling to see how far we have drifted from the emphasis of Christ. He did say He would build His church. He said it once. That was enough. But that the church is not the Kingdom—is not to *be* it, but is to *serve* it—no careful reader of the gospel ever doubts. That the Kingdom is the realm of the human spirit over which the mind of Jesus has

increasing sway is the clear definition of all that He taught concerning it; that it is invisible while the church is visible; that it is real yet ideal; that it has actual existence yet incorporeal boundaries; that it includes part of the church but vastly more; that not all the church is in the Kingdom—these and many other feaures we discern when we follow the parables of Jesus.

Now the place of the church in the Kingdom is to serve and foster it. Not all knowledge is confined to the school, but the school is the best means of fostering knowledge. Not all citizens of the Kingdom are in the church, but the church is the best means of serving the Kingdom. Hence we see how Jesus spoke rarely of the church and much of the Kingdom and how the Apostles spoke rarely of the Kingdom and much of the church.

Nevertheless it must be constanly remembered that only as the church keeps in mind the principles and methods and ideals of the Kingdom can it serve that Kingdom. If in the course of events the church adopts other principles or ideals then is it against the Kingdom, as the synagogue was against the Messianic hope of Israel. Such principles stand out clearly in the mind of Christ and are enunciated in His parables. Among these are unity, liberty, love—unity, in the divine purpose and in the consequent prosperity of the race as taught in the parable of the lost sheep; liberty, in the expression of individuality, as told in the parable of the pounds; love, as expressing itself in service, as illustrated in the good Samaritan and the judgment parables. To serve these is to serve the Kingdom. To serve the Kingdom is to exhibit that technical message without which we are weighed and found wanting.

Now what manifestations can we trace in this growing Kingdom that may guide us in finding the particular contribution which the Disciples may make to it? What conditions would seem to give hospitable welcome and

opportunity for any emphasis we have made in American Christianity?

Among the marked tendencies of the Kingdom is the outstanding desire everywhere to strip Christianity of its accretions. It is clearly recognized that Christianity has gathered about it in its transmission much that is a burden to it, precisely as the law of Moses was burdened and covered with the traditions of the elders and priests. Jesus sought to release the law to vision again but the custodians of that faith held both root and leaf to be equally sacred. Indeed they guarded the accretions with more zeal than the heart of the law. It was more important to observe washings and ceremonials than to do justice and love mercy. Christianity has fallen under the same cluttering temper. As it left the heart of Christ it was the simple essence of love toward God and man—toward one, reverence and obedience; toward the other, good will and service. To serve man was to serve God. There was no other way to serve Him. That message greeted the heart of the masses of mankind like the breezes of morning upon a fever burning brow. But as it came down through peoples and nations it gathered something in each age and in each nation that clung to it.

Like a river that takes on the color of the soil, so Christianity has been colored by the political or social complexion of its adherents in any given age. Now it is autocratic—now democratic; now social—now selfish; now intellectual—now emotional. It has been quite like the accumulations that have fastened themselves even upon the text of the book of Revelation. Some must remember the late René Gregory, successor to the great Tischendorf, and who shared with him the translation as well as the discovery of the Sinaitic manuscripts. If so you will remember that he remarked upon the growing text of the book of Revelation as he had seen it from its

earliest extant form of the fourth century to its present state. The striking fact he recited was that one text had a reading (evidently by some translator or copyist) who was so deeply moved by that portion that he had written in the margin, "If any man add to the sayings of this book," etc., while in the next translation that marginal reference was incorporated in the main text.

Now there is a universal longing to get back to the Christianity of Christ. Sometimes it takes a pathetically tragic form as where that great unchurched Christian Tolstoi "forsook all" literally in a blind pilgrimage and went out to die in the groping attempt to reach the heart of Christian living.

Or again it is expressed in the radical methods which some forms of social service take that discard the church as having any place in it. Sometimes it is ludicrously seen in the elaborate formalities with which some ecclesiasticism brings out a pet baby tradition and strangles it publicly. But whether all churchmen are working at this task or not yet all earnest men recognize and long for a return to the simple programme of Jesus. It is the desire of Matthew Arnold to see Jesus above the heads of His reporters.

The second notable tendency is a logical outcome of the first; namely, democracy. The church has seen to it that autocracy has tottered to its fall in the state. Very largely it has passed forever from the Protestant ranks of the Christian Church. Eventually it must pass from the church universal. The spirit of the Kingdom of Christ is the leaven of democracy and the immediate access of every soul to the presence of God as its inalienable right as a child of God. The message of Christ which has as its first article the nobility and dignity of the individual soul has crushed out slavery of body and will at last lift every free born son into the immediate presence of the Most High God where no man is master

save One. That tendency is most marked in the present currents of the Kingdom.

But the same great word we saw yesterday to be on the lips of this generation is already on the hearts of the men whose spirits Christ hath touched; namely, unity. While there is a temporary recrudescence of denominationalism due to the reaction from the high idealism of the war and especially of the Interchurch World Movement, yet deep within devout hearts is a great sorrow over the divided ranks of the Christian forces. The inexcusable waste and folly of the present situation gives a sense of shame to thoughtful men everywhere as they face a generation of keen business acumen that sees the material value of consolidation and unification. More that that is so clearly unchristian because it is the survival of the barbaric law of competition which Christianity is really meant to supplant with the law of coöperation. Even beyond the *need* of it is the *hunger* for it. "How can I hate him; I know him," said Charles Lamb to a questioner. Christian men have been thrown together in recent years and they cannot hate one another any longer. They long for the comprehensiveness of the Apostle Paul, "All things are mine," whether Calvinists or Anglican or mystic or pragmatist —all are mine—men cry. Indeed such revelations have come to us of this universal hunger within recent years that we are amazed as Disciples for we thought like Elijah "we even we only were left alone" with this burden. But at Geneva we heard the ancient Greek Church give utterance through its guideless patriarchs of the thousand years of petition within that great fold for unity. At every service within that vast communion prayer is made, and has been for centuries, for the unity of the followers of Christ. It may be we could easily criticise the custom as having no soul nor visible means of support in action; that might easily be said of many

sermons on unity which are still ringing in our ears or even trembling on our lips. The Anglican Movement is an expression which must be accepted as genuine as many another that is no less free from denominational finger prints.

We must never forget that the divine art of seeing others as we see ourselves came almost first to be realized when the Episcopal Church wrote the discerning estimate of the Disciples which stood almost unchanged even as a piece of propaganda on our part.

There is a yearning now felt that is deep and strong in the world; namely, the recovery of the primitive *passion* of early Christianity. We have not only accumulated much that is unchristian but we have come to be at ease in Zion. Our hymns and prayers, our sermons and testimony are devoid of the passion which they knew who turned the world upside down. Men are not conscious of being willing to pay the price which alone marks Christian zeal. A fatal paralysis is upon the Christian society. Men are holding their lives dear and their faith cheap. The lamented Sylvester Horne reminded us that early Christianity was typified in the Apostle Paul who could not have been moved to any great measure of concern if some reporter had come to his prison cell and informed him that his converts were losing their lives and holding to their faith, but that if some one had told him that they were holding to their lives and losing their faith that would have broken his heart. This latter statement, in too large measure, is the temper of soul in the modern church. From that fatal sleep there is a universal prayer to be awakened.

There is one more most pronounced tendency running through the souls of Christian men which must be mentioned. It is the social mind. It is the attitude of the followers of Christ that you cannot save one man perfectly until you save all men; that we are creatures of

environment and subject to the bondage of conditions in which the soul is not free. Consequently everybody is starting a reform or swinging into one. It is the movement within the mass which Jesus set in motion. Men may hinder it temporarily but it is the urge of the eternal breaking up through the crust of ancient system and it will have the light and equality of physical, mental and spiritual opportunity for every man. He is a wise man who does not kick against the goads.

In view of these tendencies what contribution can the Disciples make to the coming Kingdom? Have they anything to contribute? Certainly they are not to *be* the Kingdom for that is not the province of any *one* or of *all* the churches. Only those are greatest in it who serve most. All vain and cherished hopes even of having the supreme good in Christianity can never be the reasonable portion of any *one* communion, both because it is unreasonable to suppose that all wisdom is with any single body and because it is unchristian so to presume that the whole compass of truth has been taken by a comparative handful of all the populations of the earth.

But the Disciples of Christ do have a contribution to make to the spirit that now moves in the Kingdom of Christ. Let us be humble and honest enough not to claim, for present purposes, more than an ideal rather than an actual contribution.

May we modestly avow that we do have a contribution to make to the search for vital and essential Christianity. That search has been our meat and drink for a hundred years. How much of it we have actually discovered or alas have manifested is not for us to proclaim in Christian seemliness. But the fact that the Disciples do remain after more than a century, with a single exception, a free and untrammeled people without having accumulated a burden of registrations of faith and policy must challenge thinking men everywhere. That every

man who ever preached among us has been commissioned without fixed decretals save the uninterpreted New Testament as his guide and yet to have retained essential unity is a most significant and challenging fact. That we keep an unembarrassed loyalty to Christ as the key to the reinterpretation of the gospel He preached as the only possible road down which men can ever travel who go in quest of that Holy Treasure—original Christianity—this is our testimony. Even if we may not have reported the essentials of that gospel, at least this we do contend that that is the road, the only road, whereby men may find it. If by simply pointing to it we may cause others to seek it with us, even if they find it first, we will yet like John the Baptist have had our joy and may more reasonably rejoice because we have decreased that another may increase. Keeping the sources of truth open and giving the key to every man, these are the first contributions of the Disciples to the Kingdom of Christ.

This contribution has produced a second within us and which we offer to the second great current of our times; namely, the spirit of democracy. Whether we have been efficient or not we will not pause to argue here but this we do declare: We are a democratic people. In very truth he that is greatest among us is only so because he serves most. We are so democratic we have not cultivated even courtly graces, so pugnaciously sensitive of our democracy are we. But here we stand, at the end of a hundred years, and can truthfully say that no supervision has gripped us that we could not throw off to-morrow if once it were proven guilty of limiting our freedom or exercising undue authority. We are not now discussing the excess of democracy among us which works such inexcusable loss but we do affirm that the seed of that earliest word of our fathers that we should "know no man as master" has been kept inviolate until this hour.

If we have any contribution of which we are self-con-

scious, however, it is on the question of unity. It is not so much that we have a programme for unity to suggest, for every communion would offer its programme if one were asked for. But it is that the Disciples have kept the idea of unity alive. When the prayer of our Lord had been all but forgotten the Disciples have stood in all their pulpits to cry aloud, "that they might all be one." We have this to our perpetual peace of mind that the Disciples of Christ came into being out of sorrow for the divided church of Christ. It is of the very nature and essence of the cross of Christ that a religious movement should begin in travail of soul. Most of them have begun in controversy. But the spirit of Thomas Campbell brooding over the state of the church as he found it at the beginning of the nineteenth century is most like the yearning of the Apostle Paul than any other chapter of American Christianity. From his day to this the Disciples have given it emphasis in every church and conference among us. When denominationalism gloried in itself and justified divisions, the Disciples stood to proclaim its wickedness. When unity was an unpopular message our fathers made it their burden and theme. When it was regarded as a dream and impracticable delusion they preached it as an inevitable fact, if Christianity was to continue to function. In later years through the leadership of one who in his own irenic soul has been at once the truest exponent of the spirit of unity and by whose tireless ambassadorship the passion for unity has been kindled anew in a thousand centers about the world, we have had the honor of having given him to the church universal. Now that the wider yearning is here we are by no means the exclusive appeal for Christian unity. We can but humbly believe that we have had much to do with making it a living issue. When others join or even go ahead of us in enthusiasm for it (as we have witnessed in the last five years) we should

but rejoice. Beyond having it live in the conscience of the Christian world we have nothing else for which we should be chiefly concerned now.

But the Disciples have still another contribution to make to the Kingdom of God in the longing for the recovery of the primitive passion of the church. Without entering upon the message or method of evangelism among us there can be no question about the zeal or passion for it. There is no way to account for the rapid growth of this movement except the historic fact that its ministers went everywhere preaching. In every conceivable place and time the witnesses among us bore their testimony, despising no setting or opportunity howsoever humble. Churches sprang up in sordid halls and under flapping tents; in sod houses or under God's first temples, the spreading trees. After Wesley and Whitfield, Finney and Spurgeon and Moody, where will one look for the next most consistent expression of the divine compulsion to reach the masses with the message of the gospel? Where but among the Disciples of Christ? It is truly in our time an unprecedented passion of a whole people possessed with a consuming zeal to win men to Christ. If that abandon could become a common possession of the whole church coupled with a method of conservation we do not now possess, it would waken American Christianity into a new Pentecost.

If we may persist yet once more in the enumeration of possible contributions which the Disciples may make to the Kingdom we should mention the measure of social passion among us. While we have been slow to register ourselves in public assemblies, due to that overzealous care for democracy, yet the social themes of the gospel have been increasingly urged by all our ministry. Whatever else may be said about Disciple ministers they are not cowards nor trimmers. If they get a conviction they preach it at any price.

If one may make a boast modestly this would be a safe hazard; that among all the Disciple ministers there was not one important pulpit that did not and does not now support, with entire soul, the prohibition of the liquor traffic. Alas, this cannot be said of all the American ministry. Moreover, where any reform is inaugurated or social programme launched that looks toward the weal of mankind, there practically every Disciple minister may be found. And in the fast approaching hour when the church must meet the clashing issue between vested interests and the common toiler no one who knows the temper of this people has any doubt of the attitude our ministers will take. It is an asset which the Disciples may proudly offer in the service of the Kingdom.

Such in brief are some of the contributions which this young, vigorous, democratic, dead-in-earnest, typical American Christian communion is prepared to give to that growing Kingdom of Heaven among men. We do not deny that they may be found elsewhere—may even be in greater proportions, but we do insist that they are essential and that we share them.

Having said all this not out of flattery nor in immodest boasting but out of the compulsion of the plain facts, may we not now examine the conditions that hinder the Disciples from the full and free delivery of their maximum contribution to the universal fellowship of all saints?

First among these hindrances is the lack of demonstration of unity among ourselves. It is true that according to statistics we have remained essentially one people, with the strange exhibition of a downward curving offshoot which insists it is the original straight up and down trunk. But exclusive of that cleavage we do present an apparent unity. Yet those who observe us more carefully are aware of a choppy sea which does not indicate currents so much as conflict. We have the strange

exhibition of the spirit of the sentimentalism of conservatism alongside the dogmatism of liberalism. But our cleavages are not chiefly theological. They are practical as well. We go toward no common goal. We have lost our common emphasis. We see every man for himself and do that which for each is good in his own eyes. This is partially due to lack of fundamental contact through proper oversight and direction of which we will have none. Most of us know as much about the actual programme in other communions as we do about our own. We are developing a denominational complexion that is a composite of chameleon colors due to the particular reflection of each separate individualistic molecule among us. That little limerick that we get off on the Puritans would fit us as individuals appropriately. "They came to this country to worship God as they pleased and make other folks do the same." Now individualism within the accepted bonds of a functioning coöperation is the only unity that can permanently appeal to a free people. But our sad confession is that we have not gotten our unity to pull in the same direction nor at the same load.

If we exercised in sober truth the liberty we profess and extend it to our brothers as we claim it for ourselves then we should have a house of peace though filled with variety—precisely as your garden is a unit though saucy tulips perk up beside the solemn and stately gladiolus. But, because we appropriate the liberty each to himself and offer the loyalty to others we have not shown a unity which would have commended the message we bear.

Our second hindrance lies in our inefficiency. Such a glorious gospel as we believe we preach should have produced the practical result of a successfully functioning communion. What hosts of converts we have made and what multitudes we have lost! Because we adopted no system of previous culture nor of intensive cultivation

afterward, it was no great wrench of conscience to drift away from a hasty marriage with the church. Partly due to quick conversions, partly to untaught and undisciplined membership, and partly to lack of several oversights we have left behind us a sad lot of driftwood which is waterlogged and can never be kindled into a flame. If we knew the difference between theology and administration (which we seem not to know, as evidenced by the incongruous team we hitched up at St. Louis recently) we would long ago have had bishops "for administrative purposes only." Eventually all bishops will become simple administrators. If we had the eyes to see that it is too late in the world to erect a new spiritual hierarchy, since those now existing are fast dissolving into the great, new democracy, we would use the worldly sagacity which we exercise in business and government and choose out among us men of faith and wisdom and set them over the undeveloped and unhusbanded capacities of our churches. In the meantime the inefficient processes we employ that make us the perennial victims of successive promotional spasms do not commend the message we bear to those who may not be so enlightened but who walk farther in the day than we.

A third hindrance among us is lack of spiritual vision. We have fastened our eyes so long upon a formula of conversion that we have neglected the cultivation of the spiritual graces of seeing with the eyes of God. This is evidenced in the pride we have felt in what we regarded as elements of greatness among us. Was it not Matthew Arnold who said the chief book in the Bible for Christians was the book of Numbers? The Disciples have read too much out of that book. We need to remember that the elements that make a people great are not architecture nor wealth nor its numbers, but the greatness of its saints; the great souls it produces. Neither have we seen others with the eyes of God. We have no keen in-

terdenominational sense of spiritual recognition. How few of us could ever repeat the conviction of Thomas Campbell in his mutual recognition of the Christianity of those who expressed their faith through other methods and forms than his. We have yet to discover the sublimest truth in the world—the illimitability of God. He will reveal Himself to whomsoever He will, whensoever He will. And when He does so I shall prove myself as incapable of comprehending His ways if I do not also recognize His presence in such lives. Call it by whatsoever name you will but the day is at hand when any communion that has any vital place in the life of the Kingdom of Christ will recognize and welcome him whom God hath cleansed and not call him unclean because the process was not by the canons of his particular church.

If like a faithful surgeon we may still cut at the heart of our malady we should be compelled to say that we are hindered because we do not follow our plea to its logical conclusion.

Having espoused liberty we should continue in it. "How is it," said the Apostle Paul, "that having begun in the spirit ye seek now to be perfected in the flesh?" That sounds so personal that we blush to quote it. Here at the dawn of the last century was a great inspiration breathing itself out for a primitive church in its freedom and unity and comprehensiveness. Then it began to crystallize into a mechanism and at last we seek perfection, where others have sought it, in a statement of faith that must "bite" into the sensitive heart of Christ who said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." We should have been willing for "new light to break." The platform upon which we stood was consonant with all truth from whatever source. If earnest men were seeking to recover by historic processes the revelation of God as contained in the Bible we should have been the

first to bid them God speed. The very logic of the plea we have made and the appeal we urge for the distinction between the law and the gospel should have made of us pioneers in constructive criticism. Where others arraigned their membership before the judgment bar of their ecclesiastical Sanhedrins we should have demonstrated our liberty in Christ by showing how large a faith we held by utilizing all our experiences and testimony. Instead of that we have brought pressure to bear that no voice be heard upon our general platforms except those which raised no new questions.

A recent editorial in the New York *Times* made a keen thrust against our Baptist neighbors which the following quotation reveals, but its peculiar aptness to the Disciples checks any hilarity it may occasion:

"The broadside fired by President Hopkins of Dartmouth in response to a letter from certain Baptists who demanded that only such matters as agree with their dogmas be taught in colleges seems rather more formidable than the target requires. Dartmouth is not a sectarian college and the Fundamentalists in the Baptist communion do not and cannot speak for anybody but such congregations as think as they do. The real struggle for academic freedom centers in the colleges controlled by churches.

"The chief interest in Dr. Hopkins' remarks on the 'poisoned cup' lies in the fact that he is a Baptist, a member of a denomination whose long and honorable record for freedom of belief has been forgotten by too many of its members in recent years. It is a long way from Roger Williams to John Roach Straton. Fortunately the loose organization of this particular church makes it possible for the Fundamentalists to force their views on the whole denomination. So long as the Baptists hold to the principle of the autonomy of the individual congregation there will be room in that

church for intelligent men, provided they live in clusters.

"In any case the present reaction toward bigotry barks more sharply than it bites. It is serious, but fortunately there are so many bigots and so different that there is little danger of their being able to unite their forces; but the handicap of intolerance is that it usually tries to take the whole world for its field."

Likewise, we who had the passion of primitive evangelism should have been expected to be first on every mission field with unthrifty liberality of men and money. The very logic of our message and spirit would have led us there. Instead we have lingered all too long and too niggardly at home as if we were more interested in making a proselyte than in bringing in the universal reign of Christ. Indeed it sometimes seems as if every great vital element of the message entrusted to us has been practiced with such inconsistency as to have made it a question mark in the minds of our generation rather than a conviction. The truth we have had to utter, has it sounded any truer than the supposed untruth of other Christians? What we have let it do for us has spoken so loudly that men could not hear what we said.

Despite all these seemingly harsh but true words there is vast opportunity for the Disciples. We need that text preached to us which for so many years we have preached to others: "Seek ye the old paths." The old paths are humility and sacrifice and charity. Once we have seen the total background of the Christian centuries with its rich and varied testimony from a thousand angles we shall be more humble in presuming that God had no witnesses until we were born; once we go apart in intercession long enough to learn the language of prayer and its price in the presence of the cross we will release the withheld wealth of God now retained in such profaned stewardship; once we discover that though we have all proof texts and all authority

and have not love we are but the booming of a brass band; once we have learned to lose our denominational life with no thought of saving it, then we shall have made our supreme contribution to the Kingdom and we shall cry, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thee be the Glory forever and ever, Amen."

FINIS S. IDLEMAN.

Central Church of Disciples,
142 W. 81st St.,
New York City.

FOR LIBERTY, EQUALITY AND BROTHERHOOD

Lord,
Who hast set in men's hearts thine ideal of liberty,
Illumine all mankind with the knowledge of that truth which maketh free.

Lord,
Who hast set in men's hearts thine ideal of equality,
Reveal unto all mankind that in common sonship to thee,
And in this alone, is the inalienable right of equal manhood.

Lord,
Who hast set in men's hearts the ideal of brotherhood,
Make known unto all mankind
That in drawing closer to thee,
And in this alone, can they draw closer to their brethren.

Lord,
Who, throughout the ages,
Hast set working terribly amid the peoples of the earth
The leaven of thine ideals,
So that ancient wrongs are swept away,
Ancient barriers broken down,
Ancient oppressions shattered,
Look down in mercy upon our land:
Send forth among her millions, with new power, these thy great and revolutionary ideals,
Thy liberty, thine equality, thy brotherhood.

—*A Book of Prayers.*

A HALF-CENTURY EXPERIMENT IN INTERDENOMINATIONAL COÖPERATION AND ITS FAILURE

The impetus of undenominational evangelistic work in America goes back to the early Puritans. The charter, itself, of the Massachusetts Bay Company declares that to "wynn and incite the natives . . . to the knowledg and obedience of the onlie true God . . . is the principall ende of this plantation." This sounds ingenious enough to us now, but it is a fact that the pioneers of New England had hardly finished their first log cabins before they turned in dead earnest to this work. And so successful were their efforts, that in 1649, an elaborate organization, sponsored by the Cromwellian Parliament, was set on foot to back it, The Society for the Promotion and Propagation of the Gospel in New England, or as it is known to-day, the New England Society.* This was an affluent and efficient organization. Under it the Mayhews and John Eliot labored. It financed the printing of the costly Indian Bibles. And not only the Indians, but all settlements "unprovided with a gospel ministry" came under its fostering care. Until the war with the mother country it was an illustrious evangelical and undenominational missionary society and the only one in New England for the first hundred years.

The idea of "spreading the gospel to the remote and waste places of the earth" so vigorously prosecuted by this and another colonial society took deep root in New England and the Middle colonies, and immediately after the Revolution found expression in a number of strong missionary organizations sending out missionaries far beyond their own bounds. The cordial feeling existing

*At the Restoration the Society was declared defunct, but it was resurrected, duly authorized and reorganized with a board of trustees drawn from both Churchmen and Dissenter. After the Revolution its work was transferred to Canada. The Company in 1884 was supporting Baptist, Methodist and Church of England missionaries. It still exists but has issued no reports for some years. It is now listed in the Missionary Atlas of the Student Volunteer movement as a Church of England organization.

between the New England Congregationalists and the Presbyterians and Dutch Reformed of the Middle colonies made work in each other's territories welcome, and no doubt the much appreciated assistance to struggling communities from one or another of these missionaries contributed largely to the growing spirit of interdenominational coöperation. In 1801 this spirit took official form in the "Plan of Union" between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, under which it was arranged that ministers of either denomination might be placed over local churches. Upon the basis of this friendly agreement the missionary work of the various local societies, for many years, was conducted without friction.

The American Home Missionary Society goes back in unbroken lineage to the founding of the New York Missionary Society in 1796*. This was one of the first of the half dozen missionary societies formed immediately upon our separation from England. It was the first avowedly undenominational society in America. It frankly recognized denominational differences and provided careful safeguards for avoiding friction. But if it is undenominational, it is also strictly "orthodox" and puts forth a creed to which it demands subscription. Here, already is a divisive influence in this first coöperative beginning. In 1809 an auxiliary society of young people called the Assistant New York Missionary Society came into being to promote the objects of the parent society. It promoted them so vigorously that it apparently soon swallowed the parent organization entire, for in 1816 the original society seems to disappear and a new society, the New York Young Men's Missionary Society, is launched with the

*Missionary societies in the Northern states of the U. S. organized before 1800:
Society for propagating the gospel among the Indians of North America, 1787. This is sometimes called the Boston missionary society.
New York missionary society, 1796.
Northern missionary society of the state of New York, 1797.
Missionary society of Connecticut, organized in 1798, but work was begun several lears earlier, the first missionaries being sent by the General Association in 1792.
Massachusetts missionary society, 1799.

full doctrinal programme and other features of the parent organization. From the beginning of this new society the doctrinal test was a point of bitter contention. Within a year, a minority accused of Hopkinsonian heresies seceded and organized a rival society, the New York Evangelical Society of Young Men. It is interesting to note that this early doctrinal split had no reference to denominational lines but was between the conservatives and liberals of all three denominations. There was plenty of work for both societies and they continued to flourish, side by side, until 1822, sending many men to the remoter districts of the pioneer settlements.

In the year 1822, the first American home missionary convention was called in New York and official delegates were sent from nine missionary organizations of New York and New Jersey, and from the Presbytery of Albany. It was decided that the time was ripe for a united missionary effort more extensive than the various local societies could undertake. At the close of this convention the United Domestic Missionary Society was formed. The New York Evangelical Missionary Society disbanded and turned its assets over to the new organization, while the rival New York Young Men's Missionary Society reorganized itself as an auxiliary. Within two years 29 local societies in New York, New Jersey and New England had come in as auxiliaries, including the old long established societies of Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Four years after its formation, in 1826, the United Domestic Missionary Society issued a call for another convention to consider the organization of a national society. The convention met and this national society, the American Home Missionary Society, was there formed, upon the basis and according to the plan of the United Domestic Missionary Society, taking over without change the constitution of its predecessor.

Like the earlier societies, the A. H. M. S. was strictly

undenominational with open membership drawn from the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians and the Dutch Reformed. Its relationship to the Dutch Reformed Church may be briefly dismissed here. Although prominent members of that church always served as directors, its influence in that denomination was never large, and this church formally withdrew, without friction, in 1861. As a voluntary society, the A. H. M. S. served the Congregationalists admirably. Before the days of the National Council, the Congregationalists had no overhead body with which the society could come in conflict. The story of the Society's failure as a coöperative experiment is Presbyterian history.

In order to understand the relationship of the A. H. M. S. to the Presbyterians we must consider its organization. This was after the pattern of the usual voluntary association with an open membership to anyone paying dues. This secured its strictly undenominational character. The payment of one hundred dollars constituted a director. Other directors were elected annually. The directors appointed an Executive Committee in whose control the affairs of the society lay. Its income was derived from dues, gifts, and funds turned in by the auxiliaries. The auxiliaries were, practically, independent voluntary societies held very loosely. They managed their own affairs, and their only constitutional obligation to the parent society was to turn over surplus funds to it and to report annually. In return the auxiliaries might receive upon request a missionary or missionaries "to labor in such field as it may designate."

After two years of experimenting as a national society, the A. H. M. S. amplified its administrative policy, stipulating more exactly the relationship of groups it expected to come in as auxiliaries, and adopting a policy tending towards more administrative unity. It provided for the formation of two classes of auxiliaries, larger and

smaller. The larger groups of city, state, presbytery or synod, were to embrace the smaller local societies. Both groups were organized as voluntary societies, the larger groups having an auxiliary relationship to the main society, the local societies having an auxiliary relationship to the city, state or presbyterial society. Synods and presbyteries were not recognized as denominational units, but before they could deal with the parent society must be organized as voluntary societies, auxiliary to it. "Committee on Missions" these synodal and presbyterial auxiliary societies generally called themselves.

This type of organization provided for the assistance of local groups through the larger auxiliaries. Local groups, however, could be directly connected with the parent society, and, moreover, it is expressly stipulated that the parent society, if it so desires, may have the liberty of forming an independent auxiliary relationship with any local group within the bounds of the larger auxiliary. The relationship of the local group to the parent society was one of the main grounds of contention in the troubles that follow.

To the larger group with its subauxiliaries were delegated the functions of the parent society with certain restrictions. The auxiliaries had always had entire administrative control within their own bounds, being required only to report funds and deliver the surplus to the parent society. Now the larger auxiliaries were given the privilege of appointing their own missionaries to the extent of their contributions and of paying them directly. But though the missionary's commission was now issued through the auxiliary, it was still issued *by* the Executive Committee of the main society, and the final right of appointment was never surrendered. The auxiliaries, however, were carefully safeguarded. In every commission was inserted a clause insuring that the appointee be in all respects acceptable to the body which he was to serve.

This provision barred out the imposition of authority of any kind over the local body. The fact that the auxiliaries, both large and small, determined their own denominational affiliations and managed their own affairs made inharmonious denominational developments within the auxiliaries impossible, but it did not prevent the auxiliaries from developing a highly aggressive denominational consciousness. This the A. H. M. S. deplored. It persistently refused to aid Presbyterian Churches planted within the bounds of a Congregational auxiliary until this refusal became one of the chief reasons creating in the minds of the Presbyterians the necessity for a distinctly Presbyterian Board. The Society, fostered in the spirit of denominational coöperation, all through its course stood staunchly against denominational rivalry and always declined to assist a second church if there was one already on the ground which ought to cover the field.

Such was the fully perfected organization of the A. H. M. S. It was the mature result of thirty-two years of highly successful interdenominational work, and the Society felt now fully prepared to carry out still more successfully the home mission work of three denominations in the spirit of mutual help and friendly coöperation. What a pity that this carefully worked out programme of interdenominational coöperation, after so many years of successful experimentation should end two decades and a half later in complete failure!

The elements of doctrinal dissension present in the creed put forth by its first predecessor, by 1826, had already divided the Presbyterians into two hostile factions. The "Plan of Union" was not popular with the stricter or "Old School" party which stood both for centralization of authority and for rigid doctrinal orthodoxy. It was the other side, or the "New School" Presbyterians, who were chided for their brotherly but unprofitable

leanings towards a common Christian working programme with Congregationalists, who supported the A. H. M. S.

When the new society was formed and launched its ambitious national programme in 1826 the Presbyterians took official notice. The General Assembly of 1829 adopted a most cordial commendatory resolution, and in the spirit of the "Plan of Union," recommended the new society to the presbyteries, giving local bodies the option of supporting either this society or the Board of Mission of their own church. Nothing could have been uttered in a more friendly spirit than this resolution. But this did not please the Presbyterian Board of Missions. It looked upon the A. H. M. S. as a formidable rival from the first, and while there is in their report for the same year a polite endorsement of the aim of the Society, there is also strong advice given to the presbyteries that it is better to support their own ecclesiastical body than a voluntary organization.

During the first ten years, 1826-1837, the battle was waged over the Society's head and its practical work was not seriously hampered. Jointly with the A. B. C. F. M. the A. H. M. S. was an object of attack in the controversy between the Old School and the New School factions. Both societies were operating under "the Plan of Union," and it was this very spirit of interdenominational unity that was the ground of offense. In the split that followed, in 1837, the Old School Presbyterians, in parting company with the New School, took with them the Board of Missions. The New School Presbyterians organized no new Board of Missions but gave their undivided support to the A. H. M. S. as their single agent for denominational home missionary activities.

With the withdrawal of the Old School the A. H. M. S. entered upon a new phase of its existence. It became the exclusive agent for the home missionary work of two

important denominations. It is significant that this fact passes without note on either side. In the Society's annual report the withdrawal is chronicled as a disaster entailing a reduction in its work by cutting off support from Old School districts. On the part of the New School Presbyterians the General Assembly recommends it to the presbyteries and trusts it as a purely voluntary society to take care of all its home mission work. Up to this time presbyteries and synods could choose between their own Board of Missions and the A. H. M. S. The New School synods and presbyteries now have no choice. Their home mission work, if done at all must be done under the A. H. M. S. and in the Society's own way. Neither party entertains fears over the dual obligation of these presbyterial and synodal bodies to their Church and to the Society. The New School confidence in the Society is serene. And the Society assumes in Christian simplicity that the obligation to turn all surplus funds into its treasury and to coöperate loyally is still rule enough. There is mutual trust in large measure. No one asks if the Society's organization is adequate for the new obligation, for there is no recognition of any new factor in the situation. No suggestions are offered towards an administrative union.

The reign of peace which the withdrawal of the active opposition of the Old School men should have inaugurated did not come. In a surprisingly few years the very things that the Old School men had been saying against the Society were finding New School voices. The theory heard before the split, that the church itself is the only legitimate missionary organization, and that, therefore, the church should conduct its own missionary work, survived, and was put forward again by New School men to explain a constantly increasing dissatisfaction in the Society's conduct of its home missionary activities. After the end of the first ten years complaints were brought up

repeatedly to the General Assembly against the operations of the A. H. M. S.

These complaints culminated in two notorious cases.

The first was the Missouri Synod case. In this the allegation was made that the Society had taken upon itself disciplinary powers. As we have seen, the Society had no power to impose missionaries undesirable to its constituencies but it reserved the right to make appointments. These points became an issue in connection with slavery. The Society refused to commission ministers who would not conform to certain rulings regarding slaveholding within their congregations. The Society took the ground that its power of appointment made these new rulings fall within its constitutional rights, but the Missouri Synod thought otherwise and withdrew on the ground that the slaveholding rulings were the usurpation of disciplinary functions. It reasoned that the very power of the Society made discrimination in appointment equivalent to an arbitrary court judgment, asserting that if it may call a church to account for slaveholding, it may do so for any matter whatsoever.

The second case, that of the Alton presbytery, was more complicated, and plainly showed that the Society's organization was inadequate to bear the strain of dual authority under which the Presbyterian auxiliaries were placed. But to understand this case we must go back a bit.

So numerous had been the complaints to the General Assembly against the A. H. M. S., that, in 1852, a committee was appointed to investigate and report on the home missions of the church. The first committee, after reviewing the complaints and pronouncing them just grievances, still recommended the continuation of the A. H. M. S. as the missionary agency of the church, but a second committee reporting the next year, propounded

three questions to the Executive Committee of the A. H. M. S.

1. Can the Society change its rules so as to admit aid to congregations in cities and large towns?

2. Will it consent to make appropriations to churches where there is already a church of another denomination supported by the Society?

3. Will it be consistent with the rules of the Society to assist missionaries laboring under the direction of a presbytery or synod?

All of these proposals were answered in the negative by the Society with a statement that its funds could not be diverted for these purposes, but that this work must be provided for locally. If the church was to flourish denominationally these were vital issues for which the local provision suggested by the Society was quite inadequate. The General Assembly felt that these needs could be effectually dealt with only through some central administrative body. Hence in 1855 the Permanent Committee on Church Extension came into being, and although its establishment was accompanied with elaborate protestations that it was but a supplementary agency to the A. H. M. S. "engaged primarily in *missionary* not in *denominational* (!) work", it was felt by both its friends and enemies that it struck the death blow to further interdenominational coöperation.

And so it proved. The Church Extension Committee was from the first an active and able administrative body. But it was a duplicate agency set up in the same field and at two points it came into immediate conflict with the A. H. M. S.,—in its campaign for funds for the new missionary operations, and over its itinerating missionaries who were appointed avowedly to be first on new fields for Presbyterian Churches.

The case of the Alton presbytery illustrates both these difficulties. This presbytery had come into the Society

in 1840, in the regular way, through a committee on missions. This committee, of course, had entire control of the missionary operations within the presbytery. The presbytery had appointed two itinerating ministers, one of whom held a commission from the A. H. M. S. After the recommendation by the General Assembly in 1852 for the appointment of itinerating missionaries to further the denominational work of the church (a recommendation which the A. H. M. S. regarded as intrusive and officially deprecated) friction between the Alton presbytery and the Society immediately occurred. The missionary under commission from the A. H. M. S. was asked by the presbytery to raise money for a Presbyterian Church outside the bound of the auxiliary. The legitimacy of this was questioned by the Society and his commission temporarily withheld, until the presbytery in a temper, severed its auxiliary relationship to the Society.

This precipitated a question not provided for in the constitution of the Society, that is, the relationship of the individually supported churches to the general Society. The Society took the ground that the severance of the auxiliary relation of the presbyterial auxiliary severed all dependent connections and forthwith withdrew its support from all the churches within the presbytery. This the presbytery regarded as unconstitutional. The individual churches had received aid directly from the Society, and the larger churches still continued their contributions as before. It was argued that the work of the A. H. M. S. acting only as a distributing agent, not as a directing agent, was intermitted only to the extent of the salary of the itinerating missionary, which the presbytery, having withdrawn as an auxiliary, supplied now from its own resources. The relationship of the individual churches, it was maintained, was not disturbed by the withdrawal of the presbytery. They still had the

right to apply for and to receive aid and still did contribute to the Society as individual churches, so, it was stated, to the extent of their ability. That this ability was restricted by the new demands made by the new official denominational activities of the church was not to the point. The arraigners of the A. H. M. S. maintained that the various activities of the auxiliary bodies or of the individual churches receiving aid, and that the "extent of their ability" in remitting contributions, were matters, which by its very constitutions were outside the jurisdiction of the Society. The Society's one function was to dispense funds. Loyalty to the Society was not the question.

It is curious how the opponents of the A. H. M. S. hold it in the most unchristian animosity of spirit to a literalistic interpretation of a rule which was intended to permit the large degree of liberty possible only where there is harmony of purpose. As a matter of fact, this lack of inner unity expressing itself in denominational rivalry had necessitated a policy by the Executive Committee of the Society, which, when publicly acknowledged, was justly criticised as being at variance with the constitution. In the Reply of the Executive Committee to the General Assembly's commission of investigation, 1860, it is stated that "whenever an auxiliary diverted the contributions of the churches, or such of them as it could control, to an independent missionary work, its relation to, and claim upon, this Society ceased". And again, "We have no hesitation in saying . . . that we could not consent to continue aid to the feeble churches of a presbytery, in case the other churches of the presbytery should exercise the privilege claimed for them by the General Assembly of contributing the whole of their home missionary funds elsewhere than to the treasury of this Society."

Now, of course, in the simple stipulation that each

body should contribute funds to the extent of its ability, no reservation is made concerning the disposal of funds which may restrict its ability as a contributor to the A. H. M. S., so legally, the General Assembly's contention, that the presbyteries are free, under the terms of their agreement as auxiliaries, to contribute to the specifically denominational work is correct. But the Executive Committee defended its policy. Was it fair that the Presbyterian auxiliaries should spend all their available funds in the prosecution of distinctly denominational work, and then throw the new feeble Presbyterian Churches back upon the Society for support? This is just what the presbytery of Alton had done. While the Society had expended $7,500 in supporting its feeble churches, the presbytery, turning only an inappreciable sum into the treasury of the A. H. M. S., had raised $2,500 for strictly denominational work. The A. H. M. S. failed to see co-operation in this, and took the ground that when the spirit of coöperation is dead it is morally justified in refusing aid.

The denominational rivalry which had culminated in this state of strife could have but one outcome. The report of the General Assembly's commission of investigation led to the erection, in 1861, of the "Committee on Missions," which took over the work of the earlier "Church Extension Committee", and thereupon, the Assembly officially "assumed the responsibility of conducting the work of home missions within its bounds." The interdenominational experiment was finally and officially closed.

Two brief paragraphs in the Society's Report for 1862 chronicled the event. One is headed "The Presbyterian Withdrawal of 1837," the other, "The Presbyterian Withdrawal of 1861." It announced itself as still undenominational, and goes on its way unchanged by these two great disasters. But its coöperative life was over.

In 1894 it surrendered the word "American" and became frankly the "Congregational" home missionary society. It is no longer even a "voluntary" society but has reorganized upon a representative basis.

Now why did this movement for interdenominational coöperation, after its early years of successful denominational work, end in complete failure? In this day of yearning for church unity this is a pertinent question.

As we review its history this fact seems to be conspicuous. As an undenominational voluntary society, to which denominational units might entrust their work of their own free choice, it flourished. It was only when it was officially entrusted with the denominational activities of the Presbyterian system and thus changed from an undenominational agent to an interdenominational agent that its organization proved inadequate.

It would seem as if its failure were due to two main defects. First, in spite of its undenominational profession, its activities did not tend to develope a spirit of cooperation strong enough to overcome a growing denominational consciousness. The other defect was one of organization.

The success of any coöperative agent lies ultimately in its ability to perpetually renew the spirit of coöperation. In the days of the early missionary societies, the spirit of coöperation was no doubt powerfully renewed by the free movement between Presbyterians and Congregationalists. When a Presbyterian pastor could be settled over a Congregational Church, or *vice versa,* and the arrangement worked harmoniously, the spirit of intercommunion was actively at work. But as the years pass, we perceive, instead of a steadily growing movement for friendly coöperation, an increasing growth of denominational consciousness and unfriendly rivalry. The churches demand ministers of their own denomination. This rivalry did not exist in the early days. Geograph-

ical separation for one thing prevented it. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists were massed regionally. Work in New England, as a matter of course, took a Congregational form, while in New York and in New Jersey Presbyterianism dominated. As settlers moved westward these groups were mixed indiscriminately and placed in immediate rivalry. Many forces were at work developing a denominational spirit beyond the control of any one organization, and the A. H. M. S. developed no strong counteracting activities. The inner spirit of unity gave way, and the loose administrative scheme which worked excellently when this was present, failed when it was gone.

In discussing its failure as an organization, we must remember that the A. H. M. S. was not an interdenominational but an undenominational society doing interdenominational work. It had no place at all for denominational activities within its organization. The very constitution of the auxiliaries divested them of all denominational character. The individual churches aided, it is true, retained their denominational affiliations, but the individual churches were beneficiaries, not a part of the organization. The whole history of the Society's failure is the struggle between an aggressive denominational consciousness and an organization which offered no scope at all for the expression of this spirit, but insisted upon denaturing each denominational unit before admitting it.

The A. H. M. S. as an undenominational voluntary society was well adapted to the Congregationalists. Its relation with them could always be simple and direct because the single church is the administrative unit of that denomination. It was not adapted to the centralized Presbyterian system and could not carry out its programme. In the Society's early days its work in isolated Presbyterian communities presented no denomina-

tional problem as a whole, but as soon as a considerable portion of the Presbyterian home missionary work was entrusted to it, and particularly after the New School worked exclusively through it, it had the organization of the Presbyterian Church to reckon with. It was this thrust of the problem of organization into its work that defeated it.

The failure of its organization is double sided. On the one side is the failure to see clearly the purpose for which the organization is designed. On the other side, the failure to see the purpose prevents any adaptation of its original structure to meet new obligations to the Presbyterian system. For successful interdenominational coöperation there must be some larger interdenominational purpose which will include the denominations, and to which the denominations may subordinate themselves. If the A. H. M. S. had exalted the "gospel" which it was to spread, not as something painstakingly different and remote from Congregationalism and Presbyterianism, but as something comprehensive enough to include both these forms and for which both denominations might legitimately work as denominations, it would have provided the larger common purpose. This common purpose did, of course, lie behind the real spirit of coöperation which made the early years so fruitful, but it was never consciously expressed in the organization of the Society, and the insistence upon the *exclusive* nature rather than upon the *inclusive* nature of the common purpose, and the unfitness of the organization to carry out the larger inclusive idea, tended to atrophy the idea. Both the Presbyterians and the A. H. M. S. seemed blind to the Society's position as an interdenominational agent and consequently failed to adjust its organization to an interdenominational purpose. If the New School General Assembly had sought some form of administrative union with the Society, and its organization had been

changed from a voluntary to an elective basis, this change itself might have developed an interdenominational grasp of the situation. It was against human nature for an active body like the Presbyterian Church, to entrust work in which it was intensely interested to an irresponsible organization over which it had no control. When the New School delivered its home missionary work to the A. H. M. S. some sort of representative authority was needed, and if the Society had reorganized then upon a representative basis, a vision of the larger interdenominational purpose might have emerged clearly.

As it was, the Society's policy *of doing what no one else was doing,* which it reiterated ceaselessly, was not enough, when it ran up against an aggressive denominational spirit determined to get there first. The more efficient the aid given the Presbyterian Churches the stronger grew the spirit of Presbyterianism, while the dual obligation of the Presbyterian Churches to their two overhead authorities created a situation where controversy was inevitable. The Presbyterians were quite willing to accept undenominational aid but they wanted a Presbyterian product. A coöperative success must work just the other way. The denomination must throw in something for the sake of the greater interdenominational product.

One wonders if this failure were necessary. To what larger whole would it have been possible to subordinate the activities of these two denominations when the promise of organic unity offered by the "Plan of Union" had been hopelessly blighted? Would it have been possible for any home missionary society to have achieved an organization adapted to the need of selfconscious expanding Presbyterianism and yet which held such a radiant vision of larger Christian purpose than Presbyterian home missions would accept a subordinate place within it? Need such an organization have been so comprehen-

sive that it would draw in not only one department of Presbyterian work, but the whole Presbyterian Church? These are the unsolved questions of church union to-day.

The A. H. M. S. failed in the face of the very problems which our interdenominational coöperative organizations must meet to-day. It is not enough to put forth as a programme the doing of work not done by other agents. This was the whole programme of the A. H. M. S. It started things. The result was not unity but discord. The coöperative agent may not be a feeder to denominational activities, it must promote activities which have some end beyond the power of the single denomination to achieve, and it must provide the machinery of organization which will secure this inter- or better, superdenominational result.

Such a splendid foundation was laid for the success of the A. H. M. S. in the coöperative experiences of the earlier societies, and in its own early years! The spirit of coöperation was there and very much alive. Where there was on all sides such eager willingness to work together and such unlimited trust as we find between the New School Presbyterians and the Society, what a pity that an organization might not have been devised to conserve this spirit. The spirit of coöperation is here to-day actively expressing itself in new forms. Are the new organizations wise enough to conserve it?

Julia Pettee.

New York City.
417 West 121st St.,

CHRISTIAN UNION—SOME OF THE GREATEST OBSTACLES

While the sentiment in favor of Christian union is vastly more general that it was, say a century or even a half century ago, there is no doubt a variety of opinion as to the degree or type of Christian unity that is desirable. This is perfectly natural under the conditions growing out of our more than nineteen centuries of Christian history. Perhaps it would be safe to say, however, that among evangelical Christians generally, there is the recognition of the evils of sectarianism and the consequent lessening of such evils. We think it is true also that among the same people there *should* be, and perhaps is, a well-nigh universal conviction that there ought to be a sincere effort on the part of all who own Christ as Saviour and Lord to realize the fulfilment of His prayer for the oneness of His disciples, even as He and the Father are one to the end that the world might believe (John 17:20, 21); for as a matter of sober truth we are not all one in that sense and to that degree, and there are many obstacles to the realization of this unity which we do well to face earnestly and seek to remove. It is my purpose in this article to state what seem to me to be some of the chief obstacles to that unity for which Jesus prayed, and to suggest what is the best method of removing these obstacles.

It will no doubt surprise many when I say that I think *lack of knowledge of each other* is one of the chief causes of our disunity and therefore one of the chief obstacles in the way of unification of our divided Christian forces. There is, of course, a general knowledge of some of the outstanding things for which we severally stand, but these generally in wrong proportion, and in wrong relation to the more vital truths we hold in common. But what is meant by our mutual ignorance of each other is

that lack of accurate information so general among all of us of the origin, motive, and special reasons for coming into existence, together with the history and experience of our several separate bodies. Special students and teachers, there may be, who have felt it to be their duty to acquaint themselves with such facts, but this is certainly not true of the ministry as a rule, to say nothing of the mass of their membership. But this is to state only a *part* of the truth as respects the present situation among the churches. Not only is there the very general absence of accurate information concerning each other's position; but there is an almost equal prevalence of misinformation, which is largely responsible for the religious prejudice which has prevailed in the past, and which is by no means even yet wholly extinct.

It would be wrong of course to intimate that a perfect knowledge of each other's position would reveal no important differences, for such differences do exist. It is urged, however, that a sympathetic understanding of each other and of what we are seeking to accomplish in the kingdom of God would remove many misapprehensions, minify and soften our differences, magnify the truths we hold in common, and vastly increase that brotherly love and mutual confidence without which Christian union is impossible. Besides, such a spirit, when we can bring ourselves into it, puts us into the only mood in which we can study anew, with profit, the things which divide us. How many of us are prepared, for the sake of that unity for which Jesus prayed when the shadow of the Cross was upon Him, to put away all prejudices and preconceived opinions as far as possible, and take up anew, in the light of our times and under the demands of our age, a genuine restudy of those questions on which we or our fathers divided and which still separate us?

Granted that the necessity for a better understanding

of each other in order to a closer unity is quite generally recognized, there is still the question as to how such mutual acquaintanceship may best be gained. There are several methods that would be found advantageous in this respect. One of the most effective of these would be the free interchange and reading of each other's standard literature. Every religious body has certain books, pamphlets or official documents which it would be willing to rely upon to set forth the principles and practices for which it stands. Probably each body too has certain other literature by some of its members that would not fairly represent the body as a whole, and this should not be, and naturally would not be, circulated interdenominationally. But truly representative books and pamphlets cannot be too freely interchanged. Once the strong desire is created to know more fully the history and ideals of our religious neighbors we will seek such representative literature and read it, aye and *study* it with interest. And such desire will be created when we come to see that such mutual knowledge of each other is essential to Christian union and that such unity is esential to the world's conversion—"that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

There is already existing among local churches of different bodies in towns, cities, and even in the country, a much greater feeling of brotherliness than formerly existed, but it might readily be enhanced by a better knowledge of each other. Exchange of pulpits by ministers is not uncommon, but it might well become more common, with this difference that each minister might be requested to state, once at least, the things for which his people stand to the congregation for which he was the supply. The preacher who cannot do this without exciting any theological strife or sectarian feeling is out of date. He would of course emphasize the vital things in which they agree, while pointing out their willingness for a mutual

restudy of those things upon which they had reached different conclusions.

Of course an ever-increasing coöperation among the churches of different creeds in the promotion of common Christian ends in the community, state, nation and in the world is a potent means of promoting mutual acquaintance with each other, breaking down existing prejudices, and kindling the fires of brotherly love. It is also the best way of convincing the world that there does exist some degree of unity among Christians of different names. The coöperation of evangelical Christian bodies through the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is doing much to lower denominational walls, and to illustrate the need and practical utility of a closer unity among Christ's followers. In this relationship to each other they are bringing their influence to bear in the accomplishment of common ends, while at the same time they are promoting that mutual acquaintanceship which is essential to a closer and more effective union.

After all what is that bond of unity the recognition of which makes us all, by whatever name we may be called, recognize our common spiritual kinship? Is it not our recognition of Jesus of Nazareth as both Lord and Christ, and our love for and fealty to Him in doing His will as far as we understand it? One of the first discoveries we shall make when we study each other's position with the supreme desire to know each other better is the preponderating influence and supreme place of Christ in every evangelical body. Indeed it is precisely this fact which makes them evangelical, that is, *gospel* Christians. But have we not permitted some subordinate doctrine or practice in each other's scheme of things to obscure this fact, the rediscovery of which is certain to strengthen the bond of Christian fellowship? And here is another question that calls for the most heat-searching examination on the part of all of us: In our denominational zeal have

we not so emphasized the things that are peculiar to us and which have been supposed to justify our denominational existence, as to put into the background the more fundamental truths we hold in common and on which we must be united if Christ's prayer for the unity of His followers is to be answered?

That *"if"* in the last sentence expresses a doubt which is hardly consistent with our Christian faith. Are we justified in questioning whether or not Christ's prayer to His Father, uttered just before His supreme sacrifice for the world's redemption, will be answered? "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one, even as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us, that the world may believe that Thou didst send me" (John 17:20, 21). That "all" includes Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Disciples of Christ, Christians, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and those of all other religious bodies, *in so far as we are believers on Christ.* And both the thing prayed for and the *reason* are distinctly stated: "that they all may be one" —"that the world may believe that Thou didst send me." It is certain that all who accept Jesus as the Sent of God are desirous that the world shall accept Him as such; but we do not all seem to realize the essential relation, as Jesus saw it, between Christian unification and the enthronement of Christ as King over all the world. And yet a little reflection will make apparent the power there is in Christian unity to cause men to accept the Christhood of Jesus.

First of all, we recognize the truth of the old saying, "In union there is strength." We see this illustrated in a thousand ways. It was illustrated on a very large scale in our late world war. It was by the united power of the allied nations that a signal victory was won over organized and well-disciplined forces which threatened the

peace and freedom of mankind. It is the recognition of this fact that has brought about this world conference of the representatives of so many nations to agree upon a limitation of armaments and to find a basis of coöperation whereby the peace of the world may be preserved. If the nations of the world see the necessity of union in order to promote the peace and progress of mankind, is it any wonder that the church of Jesus Christ, in view of the moral and religious peril which threatens the world, should be deeply concerned about the unification of its divided forces? The truth is the ablest statesmen of the world to-day realize, as never before, that the destinies of the several nations are so linked together that what affects the welfare of one affects the welfare of all, and that some sort of a *united* effort to prevent war is necessary to preserve our civilization from destruction. In his "Outline of History," H. G. Wells calls attention to a fact often overlooked; namely, the vast revolution in human thought since the war of 1914-1918, as relates to war and international relationships. The sentiment of the people is strongly for unification and in favor of the subordination of national *sovereignty* to the common interests of mankind, he contends. Answering the objection sometimes made by "unhopeful prophets" that such gathering of the nations together in closer association would produce "race conflicts," he says, "that is to suppose that civilization is incapable of adjustments by which men of different qualities and temperaments and appearances will live side by side, following different roles and contributing diverse gifts. *The weaving of mankind into one community does not imply the creation of a homogeneous community, but rather the reverse; the welcome and the adequate utilization of distinctive quality in an atmosphere of understanding*" (pages 592-3).

The realization of a united world, which Mr. Wells describes, may not be as far off as it seems to be. But,

however that may be, the time is certainly at hand when the church should be closing up its divided ranks in order to a more effective resistance of the powers of darkness, and to a more effectual spreading of that "true light" which is intended to "lighten every man coming into the world." There are "unhopeful prophets" in the church who think Christian union is impracticable. "You cannot get everybody to think alike," is a common way of putting this objection. Again Mr. Wells' reply to his "unhopeful prophets" will be found helpful and applicable here. No one who understands human nature —even *regenerated* human nature—expects all men to "think alike." Any theory of Christian union that is based on uniformity of thought is vain, being both impracticable and undesirable. But are we not all coming to see with more or less clearness the practicability and the divine urgency of exalting our faith in the personal Christ so far above all our theological opinions and systems, as to *subordinate* our denominational zeal to the common interests of Christ's kingdom? This process has been going on, all unconsciously perhaps, in all religious bodies for some time. That is why we think it an important step toward Christian union that we become more thoroughly acquainted with each other.

Of course it is assumed in the foregoing that Christ is the center and source of the unity for which He prayed. This we think will not be denied by any Christians, certainly not by Protestant Christians. But the question will be raised at this point, What is the character of the Christian union which will meet the demands of New Testament teaching and of Christ's prayer? Some will claim that we already have as much union as is desirable; but the number of such is rapidly diminishing. However, among those who realize that, as members of separate denominations, we have not yet attained to that "unity of the Spirit" which creates the "bond of peace," there

is no doubt a variety of opinions as to what that ultimate and ideal union is to be. On that question there is no room for dogmatism. None of us may claim to see to the end of what God is bringing to pass in His church. Nevertheless, there are some things so clearly revealed, some forward steps that are so manifestly essential to that union that is to conquer the world, that there is no need to wait for a further revelation of light in order to take those steps to which faith and duty clearly point. The way to get additional light from God is to be true to the light we already have. "To every one that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away from him" (Luke 19:26). We do not *have,* in any true sense, that which we do not *use.*

May it not be that our failure to be true to the light we have had on this subject is the cause of any lack of clearness of vision that may exist at the present time? Paul declared before king Agrippa that he was "not disobedient to the heavenly vision." Although that "vision" showed him a path of duty and of service diametrically opposed to that which he had hitherto been pursuing in all good conscience, he *at once* entered upon that new path, and *continued* in it though it led to trials, persecutions, imprisonments and death. Something of that spirit of loyalty to the right, as God gives us to see the right, is an essential condition of Christian union. Let us mention a few of the steps, both positive and negative, which are apparent to all who have eyes to see, and who *wish* to see, which the church of our day must take to meet the demands of our Master's prayer for the unity of all who believe on Him:

1. It must recognize and *realize* the truth involved in that prayer, that the unity of Christians is essential to the conversion of the world.

2. It must face the obvious fact that Christians are

now divided, and that these divisions are stumbling-blocks in the way of the progress of Christianity.

3. It must see that these divisions have been caused by an undue stress upon things non-essential, and by a corresponding *lack* of emphasis on things vital and fundamental.

4. Seeing this it should begin *at once* to be obedient to the "heavenly vision," both by laying aside the things we *know* to be obstacles to union, and which we *know* are not enjoined upon us by divine authority.

5. There must be a fresh, unbiased restudy of each other's history, position and spirit. It will probably turn out that many of our aims are the same or so similar that they need constitute no justification for our divisions, with a proper understanding of that liberty to think for oneself, which is the birthright of every Christian.

6. There will have to be a clearer and more definite distinction made between matters of *faith* and matters of *opinion*. In other words, Jesus Christ, Son of God, and Son of Man, crucified, buried and risen again, for human redemption from the power of sin and death, and now seated at the right hand of the Father—*He* is the object of that faith which has power to save and power to unite a divided Church. This faith of course implies obedience to all that He has clearly commanded, and the acceptance of all that He has clearly taught. But outside this realm of divine certainties, upon which there is general if not universal agreement, there are honest differences of understanding concerning other requirements and teaching of our Lord and of His chosen apostles, both as to the *manner* of obediecce to such requirements and as to the content or interpretation of such teaching.

This last point brings us face to face with the supreme problem that must be solved in order to the complete unification of a divided church. How shall we deal with

these differences—differences that involve the consciences of men seeking to do God's will as they understand it? Ought men to be disloyal to the dictates of their own conscience for the sake of union? Certainly not. Is conscience, then, a safe guide to the truth? This question has often been raised. No, it is not an infallible guide to *truth,* but conscience, enlightened by such truth as we have, is a true guide to *duty* at any given time; that is, it is the moral faculty by which each individual determines what is right and what is wrong for *him.* Now when we add that conscience is involved in some matters relating to creeds, outside the fundamental creed mentioned above, and also in conditions of church membership, we find ourselves against a barrier to an immediate union of Christian forces such as we are sure Christ would like. But it is a barrier which Christian growth, with its wider horizon and its deeper spiritual insight, must and will remove. Nor must any of us assume that all the growing must be done by the others. Those who imagine that their doctrinal and spiritual attainments are such as to admit of no change or improvement, are likely to prove the greatest hindrance to the unity of Christ's church.

What, then? Are we, because of these conscientious limitations, to postpone indefinitely the work of promoting Christian unity? Certainly not. Such facts only show that Christian union is not so much an *act* as a *process*—a consummation to be achieved *progressively* by growth in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him, Who

is the Head, even Christ; from Whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body into the *building up of itself in love"* (Eph. 4:13-16). This remarkable passage from this great leader of Christian thought—this chosen instrument of Christ—through whom He made a wider and profounder revelation of His grace and truth to His church, shows us this apostle's conception of unity. First, that the unity of the church of Christ, which is His body, is a part of His plan and purpose, and is ultimately to be realized. Second, that this unity centers about Christ's personality, in Whom there is to be "unity of faith, and knowledge of the Son of God." Third, that this consummation is to be attained by *growth,* through the periods of spiritual childhood, adolescence and manhood. Fourth, that this "increase of the body," which is "fitly framed and knit together" from its vital connection with Christ, is the result of *"the building up of itself in love."*

This brings to the front *love,* which this same apostle declares elsewhere to be greater than even faith and hope, as the dominating principle which is to solve this problem. It is only in the atmosphere of love that unity can grow. Sectarianism withers and dies in such an atmosphere. All the finer virtues and graces flourish where love abounds. It is in the sunshine of love that we come into closest communion with Christ, and into closest fellowship with each other—even with those whose theology differs from ours, but whose love for Christ makes them our brethren. It is only as we breathe the atmosphere of love that we long for the unity of God's people, and blend our prayers with that of the Master for this blessed consummation. Therefore, let us cultivate this chief of the Christian graces, in whose sacred flame all denominational jealousies, misunderstandings and strifes will be

consumed, and in whose light we shall see our way to link hands and hearts together as brethren, and as members of the same body, in a united effort to hasten the universal reign of Him Whose gospel alone can bring "peace on earth and good-will." Amen.

J. H. Garrison.

Los Angeles, Calif.

FOR THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

Our God, we thank thee,
That to thee there are no barriers between this world and the other;
But that, hand in hand, they who have passed on and they that remain
May even now in prayer draw nearer to thyself and to each other,
As unitedly and as naturally as little children around their mother's knee.

We thank thee that in thy presence all barriers break,
All illusions dissolve,
All accidents of time and space vanish away,
All separation, all bereavement, is abolished
In the exceeding glory of thy audience chamber.

Keep us all safe to-day in thy spiritual city,
Both those that see thee face to face,
And we whose vision is yet dimmed by the flesh:
Give us all work to do, battles to fight, difficulties to overcome,
And the joy of victory.

Grant that we may know ourselves working together in thy one service,
Each in each knowing and sharing
The hard and the smooth, the bitter and the sweet,
Members of each other made one in thee—
One tool to work for thee,
One weapon to fight for thee,
One new creature in thyself.

—*A Book of Prayers.*

APPROACHES BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN AND SWEDISH EPISCOPATES

One of the most significant steps in the great movement toward Christian unity was taken the other day when the Archbishop of the Swedish Church sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury a favorable reply to the action of the last Lambeth Conference, which expressed the wish that the Swedish Church might see its way to enter into a state of intercommunion with the Anglican Church. Thus two of the great communions with the episcopal order recognize each other's orders as valid and the six million members of the Swedish Church can gather at the same table with their millions of Anglican brethren, and the ministers of both churches can take part in the services of each of these great communions.

We have Archbishop Söderblom's letter before us—it is also signed by the Bishop of Lund and the Bishop of Skara—and it is a very interesting document. After expressing deep satisfaction with the action of the Lambeth Conference it proceeds thus: "That the Lambeth Conference, after long and thoroughgoing negotiations which have taken place in this matter during recent years, now for its own part has found the time come for a closer connection between the two churches of such a kind as, from its most important feature, might be called intercommunion. This is to us a source of real joy, because we see therein a step towards that great goal for which we pray and strive with you: that the unity which has always existed and exists between all true disciples of Christ should be better realized than hitherto also in external matters, and also because of the direct and practical importance which such a connection must have for the work to which our church is called, for the pastoral task which is imposed upon her by the Lord of the church even for those of its members who live outside

the borders of their own country, and particularly for those who live within the British Empire."

The letter then proceeds to state the attitude the Swedish Church has historically taken on the matter of admitting members of other denominations to the communion, and also proceeds to give the interpretation the Swedish Church puts upon this new step toward unity. The latter is very positive in stating that the Swedish Church has generally conceded the right of communion to those members of other churches who have desired occasionally to take part in the sacrament in their church for the strengthening of their inner life. On the other hand, the concession of this right *in genere* to the members of a particular communion presupposes an essential agreement in faith and doctrine. The letter points to historical instances where Lutherans and Anglicans have communed together. Neither has the Swedish Church attached decisive weight to the doctrine of the apostolic succession of bishops and to the conception of ministerial orders held by the Anglican Church. The Anglican Church is aware of this, for the Swedish Church emphasized these points before the committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1909 to confer with the Swedish bishops.

This is so important a matter, in view of the fact that the Anglican Church not only accepts but proposes intercommunion knowing this attitude, that we quote from the letter the paragraphs relating to this point:

"No particular organization of the church and of its ministry is instituted *jure divino*, not even the order and discipline and state of things recorded in the New Testament, because the Holy Scriptures, the *norma normans* of the faith of the church, are no law, but vindicate for the New Covenant the great principle of Christian freedom, unweariedly asserted by St. Paul against every form of legal religion, and applied with fresh strength

and clearness by Luther, but instituted by our Saviour Himself, as for instance when, in taking farewell of His disciples, He did not regulate their future work by *a priori* rules and institutions, but directed them to the guidance of the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost.

"The object of any organization and of the whole ministry being included in the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments—according to the fifth article of the Augustana, God had instituted *'ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta'*—our church cannot recognize any essential difference, *de jure divino,* of aim and authority between the two or three orders into which the ministry of grace may have been divided, *jure humano,* for the benefit and convenience of the church.

"The value of every organization of the *'ministerium ecclesiasticum'* and of the church in general is only to be judged by its fitness and ability to become a pure vessel for the supernatural contents and a perfect channel for the way of divine revelation unto mankind."

It will be seen from the above quotations that the Anglican Church enters into this intercommunion with open eyes, knowing the Swedish Church does not attach that importance to the apostolic succession and to orders that the Anglican Church does. The decisive point with the Anglican Church seems to have been the fact that the Swedish Church has *the apostolic succession* and that its ministers *have been regularly ordained,* regardless of any construction the Swedish Church puts upon the fact or any importance it attaches to it. While this seems to have been the decisive fact with the Anglican Church, the letter from the Swedish bishops takes explicit pains to say that it was not so with them, but that the decisive fact with them was that there seemed to be fundamental agreement as to the content of the faith and the message of salvation. Here the Swedish Church rejoices to find

practical unanimity. As the letter says, "We do not hesitate to pronounce as our opinion that during the course of the preparatory negotiations and so far as we have gradually got to know more about the Anglican Church our impression of that unity which binds the two Churches together in what is deepest and most central has become predominant."

The letter of the Swedish bishops evidently recognizes that there are two groups within the Anglican Church, the Catholic party and the Protestant party, and takes pains to make it very plain that they accept intercommunion on the understanding that at heart and in the widest extent the Anglican Church is a Protestant communion. It insists, first, that no other authority must be put directly or indirectly above the Holy Scriptures, or even on a level with them. Jesus Christ as revealed in the Gospels and the apostolic word is the seat of authority in religion. "The prophetic and apostolic message has sprung out of the revelation of God himself and is itself a part of this revelation. All later expressions of the Christian faith, however great their value may be * * * must always be tested * * * in the light of the revelation itself, which is recorded, confessed and interpreted in the prophetic and apostolic message, and is thus accessible to us also." We do not know how the Catholic party within the Anglican Church is going to accept this very emphatic statement as to the Scriptures being the seat of authority in religion. To the Catholic the church is the seat of authority, the channel of grace, and the present voice of Christ in the world. The church not only comes before the Scriptures in authority, but also in time. The Gospels and Epistles are the product of the church. The church has the final word.

We wonder also if the Catholic party will be pleased over the explicit emphasis the Swedish bishops put upon salvation by grace without priestly or sacramental medi-

ation. The letter goes out of its way to emphasize the evangelical view of religion. "The revelation is throughout essentially a revelation of God's preëminent and unconditional grace, precedent and independent of all human endeavor." "The new moral life is a fruit of this communion with God, which has been opened to us independently of any works of man." Of course, this is Luther's attitude. It is that emphasized over and over again in Dr. Galover's reply to the Lambeth Appeal for Unity, which Dr. Clifford says represents the Free Church view very fairly. But it is not the view of the Catholic party within the Anglican Church, and that party is very strong. Their fundamental doctrine of grace is that it is mediated through the sacraments, and it is at the altar one comes into the real presence of God.

The rest of the letter is devoted to details such as the participation of Anglican bishops in Swedish ordinations and the participation of Swedish bishops in Anglican ordinations (already two Anglican bishops, the Bishop of Durham and the Bishop of Peterborough, have assisted, at Uppsala, in the consecration of Swedish bishops); the laying on of hands in ordination (the Swedish bishops have not been in the habit of placing hands upon the head); and the matter of the diaconate. These are matters for adjustment. After all, the significant things are these: (1) That the Anglican Church has recognized the validity of Swedish orders; (2) that the Anglican Church has been willing to establish intercommunion with a church that does not hold the theory of succession and orders commonly held by that communion and with a church that does not take the sacramental view of religion held by a large and powerful part of the Anglican Church; (3) that the Swedish Church considers the Thirty-nine Articles as the same for substance of doctrine as the Augustana Confession, and (4) that the Anglican Church is willing to establish intercommunion

with a church which admits members of all Christian churches to its pulpits and to the table of the Lord. This is all very encouraging and ought to encourage other steps toward union and make them easier of accomplishment.

FREDERICK LYNCH.

Editorial Office, The Christian Work,
New York City.

The Larger Prayer

At first I prayed for Light:
  Could I but see the way,
How safely, swiftly would I walk
  To everlasting day!

And next I prayed for Strength,
  That I might tread the road
With firm, unfaltering feet, and win
  The heaven's serene abode.

And then I asked for Faith:
  Could I but trust my God,
I'd live enfolded in His peace,
  Though foes were all abroad.

But now I pray for Love,
  Deep love to God and man:
A living love that will not fail,
  However dark His plan.

And Light and Strength and Faith
  Are opening everywhere!
God only waited for me till
  I prayed the larger prayer.

—E. D. Cheney.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The most significant message sent out from the Chinese National Christian Conference at Shanghai, May 2-10, is that which has to do with the united and indigenous church. The message in part is as follows:

We Chinese Christians who represent the various leading denominations express our regret that we are divided by the denominationalism which comes from the West.

We are not unaware of the diverse gifts through the denominations that have been used by God for the enrichment of the church.

Yet we recognize fully that denominationalism is based upon differences the historical significance of which, however real and vital to the missionaries from the West, are not shared by us Chinese. Therefore denominationalism, instead of being a source of inspiration, has been and is a source of confusion, bewilderment, and inefficiency.

We recognize also most vividly the crying need of the Christian salvation for China to-day, and we firmly believe that it is only the united church that can save China, for our task is great and enough strength can only be attained through solid unity.

Therefore, in the name of the Lord, who prayed that all may be one, we appeal to all those who love the same Lord to follow His command and be united into one church, catholic and indivisible, for the salvation of China.

We believe that there is an essential unity among all the Chinese Christians and that we are voicing the sentiment of the whole Chinese Christian body in claiming that we have the desire and the possibility to effect a speedy realization of corporate unity, and in calling upon missionaries and representatives of the churches in the West, through self-sacrificial devotion to our Lord, to remove all the obstacles in order that Christ's prayer for unity may be fulfilled in China.

We confidently hope that the Church of China, thus united, will be able to remain an impetus to the speedy healing of the broken bodies of Christ in the West.

We Chinese Christians do hereby acknowledge that the church is the spiritual home of Christians where we receive a spiritual nurture which should not be alien to the racial inheritance and spiritual experience of our people.

We register our appreciation and gratitude for the devoted and self-sacrificial service of the missionaries who have helped to build up the Christian Church in China, and for the churches in the West which have made the service of these missionaries possible.

But we wish to voice the sentiment of our people that the wholesale, uncritical acceptance of the traditions, forms, and organizations of the West and the slavish imitation of these are not conducive to the building of a permanent, genuine Christian Church in China.

We notice, moreover, that the Chinese Church is becoming conscious of her own unique mission and duty to-day.

The history of China, the characteristics of the people, the nature of the work, the results of our past experience, and the rapidly changing conditions of the country all demand an indigenous church which will present an indigenous Christianity—a Christianity which does not sever its continuity with the historical churches but at the same time takes cognizance of the spiritual inheritance of the Chinese race.

Therefore we appeal to all the followers of Jesus Christ in China, with united effort, through systematic giving, to reach the goal of self-support; through persistent practice, fearless of experiment and failures, to reach the goal of self-government; and through religious education, an adequately trained leadership, and devoted personal work to attain the goal of self-propagation.

We declare further that the time has come when Chinese Christians should make a careful study and with courageous experimentation find out what should be the forms and organizations and method that are the most practicable and helpful for the establishment of an indigenous church.

We call upon the missionary leaders of the church to assist the Chinese in carrying out this great task by their useful advice and by giving unfettered freedom to the Chinese Christians in these experiments.

We confidently hope that the time will soon come when the Church of China will repay in part of that which she has bountifully received from her mother churches in the West, the loving tribute of the daughter—contributions in thought, life, and achievement for the enrichment of the Church Catholic.

Christian unity in Australia, according to *The Challenge*, London, has been marked by an historic conference in that country. *The Challenge* says:

The initiative was taken by the Anglican Church in Australia, acting through the Committee on Reunion appointed by the General Syond, which sent an invitation to the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches to appoint representatives to confer with selected representatives of the Anglican Church on the basis of the Lambeth Appeal. There was a hearty response to this invitation, and the Conference which was the outcome of it consisted of eight representatives from each church, including, on the Anglican side, the Archbishop of Sydney, the Archbishop of Brisbane, three bishops, and, on the non-Anglican side, the Moderator-Gen-

eral of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, the Chairman of the Congregational Union of Australia and New Zealand and other men of note appointed by the respective churches.

The spirit of the Conference was remarkably good throughout. Writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald,* one of the delegates (Rev. Dr. Carruthers, an ex-President of the Methodist General Conference) says: "Nothing could exceed the courtesy, and at the same time the frankness, of the delegates one to another. There was perfect openness and candour, whilst at the same time there was a geniality of spirit that enabled the straightest things to be said without acerbity on the one part or resentment on the other. The Upper Room atmosphere was markedly present, and not a few of the speeches reached a high level of spiritual emotion. Invisible spiritual bonds bound all together, whilst ecclesiastical views revealed divergencies that it was the general aim to bridge over, even if the chasm could not be closed up." And the testimony of an Anglican delegate (Rev. P. A. Micklem) is no less emphatic. Writing in the *Australian Christian World,* he says: "The subjects for discussion had been carefully selected as those round which the main difficulties in the way of reunion ranged, and it says much for the spirit and tone of the discussions that in each case a large measure of agreement was reached and took shape in formal resolutions. In certain fundamentals, indeed, we found ourselves from the outset on common ground, and that, too, with regard to questions on which ten years ago, or even less, there were still wide differences of opinion. The dangers and folly and sin of disunion were, for example, explicitly acknowledged. There was full agreement, too, that the unity which was God's will and for which we were working must be manifested in one visible organic society; nor was there any question that the bonds of that unity must include not only a common faith, but a common ministry both of the Word and of the Sacraments."

The chief subjects discussed were episcopacy, ordination, and creeds, and the greatest unanimity was reached with regard to the first of these. Noteworthy admissions were made on both sides. To quote Dr. Carruthers again: "On the Episcopal side it was conceded that there is no method or form of church government at present in existence that can claim to be exclusively apostolic, and that the question for to-day is not what form of government existed in the church 1500 or 1900 years ago, but what is the best to be done in the present age and for the Australia of to-day. On this point the plea of the Bishop of Bathurst was searching and effective. On the non-Episcopal side, it was admitted that of the Christendom of the world at present three-fourths is organized on the episcopal basis, and that in any large view of reunion this fact must be taken into consideration. But it was also held that episcopacy may be organized on a democratic and constitutional basis."

The following is the very remarkable resolution moved by an Anglican delegate (Dr. Long, Bishop of Bathurst, seconded by a Methodist delegate (Dr. Prescott), and unanimously carried:—

"That, while the right of the church to determine its own polity at any time is recognised, in the opinion of this Conference, in view of all the circumstances, it is expedient that the polity of the reunited catholic church be episcopal, provided that

(1) The appointment to the office of a bishop be shared in by ministry and laity;

(2) That such office be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, *i.e.*, that in all administrative actions the bishop should be responsible to the representative assembly, conference, or synod of the church;

(3) That such acceptance of episcopacy does not necessarily imply that ministerial authority cannot be otherwise obtained, or that episcopacy is the only channel of divine grace."

It was further moved by an Anglican, seconded by a Congregationalist, and agreed:

"That this Conference welcomes the assurance implied under clause four of the Lambeth Appeal, that each group within the reunited church would be free to retain its characteristic method of worship and service, in so far as such retention is not inconsistent with the fellowship of the whole."

A much more difficult subject was that of ordination, the difficulty arising from the statement in the Lambeth Appeal: "It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship." The Anglicans held that the phrase "episcopal ordination" did not imply any reflection on ordination in any other form, but simply meant laying on of hands. Then non-Anglican delegates, in view of the express language of the Appeal, could not accept this interpretation, and were not prepared to submit to a condition which implied that their ministerial position was either irregular or invalid. In the end, after protracted discussion, it was moved by an Anglican (Bishop Long), seconded by a Presbyterian (Professor Angus), and agreed:—

"That this Conference recommends that the mutual recognition of episcopal and non-episcopal orders and commissions be thoroughly explored by the respective churches, and to this end recommends the appointment of a committee by this Conference for the purpose of receiving reports from such churches, and ascertaining the possibilities of arriving at a common mind, and reporting to a further Conference suggestions as to details or formula of any such commission or commissions. Further, that the committee consist of the Bishop of Willochra (convener), the secretaries of the Conference, and two representatives from each church, making a total of eleven in all."

An interim joint committee was appointed (1) to make arrangements for any future conference on reunion; (2) to prepare a draft of a state-

ment of agreement on matters of faith and order; (3) to consider and recommend definite schemes of coöperation.

The Conference was in smoother waters when it reached the subject of creeds, and the following resolution was agreed to:—

"That, while conditions of membership in the reunited church might be satisfied by the Apostles' Creed, or some shorter and simpler form of personal confession of the Christian faith, a corporate creed would be necessary as a common standard precedent to union, and for this purpose the Nicene Creed would be a most appropriate and acceptable form."

The attitude of the Conference to the negotiations for union of the three non-Anglican Churches which have been carried on for some years is made sufficiently clear by this resolution:—

"That this Conference desires to take the opportunity of expressing its sympathy with the movement for the union of the Presbyterian, Methodists, and Congregational Churches, and its hope that the movement will not be delayed, in view of the prospect of any wider movement, since any union effected between two or more churches would simplify and faciliate the problem of the wider unity contemplated by this Conference."

The next Conference on reunion will meet early in 1923.

This word from the editorial columns of the Daily *Register,* Adelaide, South Australia, is interesting:

Acute divisions and wide cleavage, which have been visible in organized Christianity for ages cannot be healed and obliterated in a few years. The task of reuniting the church on the foundation laid by the apostles necessarily demands the exercise of the qualities so abundantly manifested by the divine Founder—love, meekness, lowliness of heart, and consuming zeal for truth. It demands a frank readiness to closely re-examine ancient creeds and formulas, with a view to their revision, so far as they may hamper the movement toward unity on a basis unanimously recognized as in accordance with New Testament teaching. Human nature at the best, is frail, and church divisions have promoted uncharitableness, unholy pride, and exclusiveness. These plain facts render the more extraordinary the progress recently made in Australia in the direction of Christian union. A spirit of brotherly affection and fellowship between the leading clerical and lay representatives of several denominations has been cultivated to a remarkable degree, under the powerful constraint of the growing conviction that disunion and separation have been contrary to the will of the Head of the church, that all sections of the divided church are more or less blameworthy on this account, and that the witness to Christianity has suffered and is suffering grievously through the failure of the various communions to combine their forces in efforts to evangelize the world.

On the decision of five Anglican clergymen in Canada and five Presbyterian to seek reordination in conformity to the Lambeth Appeal, *The Living Church* dissents from their action, while the New York *Churchman* calls it a work of merit, and says:

They proposed to the bishop of Montreal and the presbytery of Montreal and the presbytery of New York that authority be obtained from the national body of each of the churches to ordain at once the five petitioning ministers of the other church, it being specified in each ordination that "herein there is no repudiation of, or reflection on, their past ministry."

This action is not so precipitate as it sounds. Since Lambeth met, two years ago, the problem of church unity has had a history in Canada. In this respect Canada differs from the United States. Church unity has slumbered among us. Lambeth never caused a ripple upon the smooth surface of our institutional life other than to produce at the time of the returning bishops some exuberant prophecies and sermons. There the matter has rested. The Montreal *Gazette* gives the following history of efforts in Canada to interpret Lambeth:

It will be remembered that deep interest was aroused locally by the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference of Bishops of the Church of England on this subject of reunion of Christendom. Its sympathetic tone was responded to in many quarters, and placed the whole movement upon a higher basis. The Presbyterians of Montreal took action at once and their presbytery requested the bishop of Montreal to convene a conference of delegates from both churches. A joint committee was appointed and worked together for a year, with wonderful agreement and progress, the outcome being what was known as the Montreal Conference resolutions. Chief among these was a proposal suggested by the Lambeth Conference, that, for the time being, until full union should be consummated, there should be, under due safeguards, a mutual and reciprocal ordaining or commissioning of clergy in either church to minister in the other, while for the present retaining their ordinary positions in their own churches. These resolutions were at once submitted to the Montreal Presbytery, which unanimously approved them, and later to the General Assembly, which also endorsed them. They were later reported to the General Synod of the Anglican Church, which, while not accepting them as they stood, passed a strong resolution for immediate conference with the other churches on this subject of reunion.

We are inclined to agree with the editor of *The Living Church* that these ten men are doing violence to the intentions of Lambeth. We make our inference not from what Lambeth said, but from what we know of its composition and temperament. Lambeth was merely a collection of bish-

ops. A collection of bishops, unless carried by the Spirit along with currents going whither they know not, are not likely to be more daring than the same bishops individually have proved to be. We know what bishops sat at Lambeth. We know the hereditary convictions of most of them. We know what they have been disposed, hitherto, to do for church unity. We have observed that they have not given the slightest indication that they welcome steps toward church unity in the direction of Christian fellowship which the Spirit, at a fateful moment at the conference two years ago indicated as the right venture of faith.

Even under the propulsion of the Holy Spirit, the bishops at Lambeth corporately made no revolutionary utterances, proposed no risks that were world-shaking; yet to do them justice, their pronouncement betrayed a troubled conscience and wistful longings for something better than the dry, unimaginative ecclesiastical phrases with which they have wrapped and hidden for generations the whole problem of a unified church. They did speak an earnest word, but that is as far as they have gone. Lambeth counselled fellowship as the unifying basic force in the Christian Church. But fellowship has not advanced one jot or tittle in the United States. In some dioceses there has been a retrograde movement. In many dioceses it never existed, and no one seems to be taking the slightest trouble to act on the suggestion of Lambeth. Fellowship—churchmen of different name coming together to pray, to break together at the Lord's Table the Bread of Fellowship, to wait upon God together, that they may receive a revelation of His purpose and plan—we have seen no evidence that the American Church trusts the workings of such fellowship.

In advancing church unity in America, Lambeth has meant nothing. No one has challenged its meaning. Therefore, we are inclined to think that the editor of *The Living Church* is right. Lambeth did not mean to encourage what these rash gentlemen in Canada have proposed to do. The bishops assembled at Lambeth under the urge of the Holy Spirit, said one or two great words; but they knew not what they said. Since the day of adjournment their ardor has cooled. We are, therefore, delighted that these bold Canadian brothers have seemed to say: Let us test these official pronouncements in high places on reunion. They may not have meant what we think; but we should like to know whether they meant anything.''

We wish our friends in Canada God-speed in their venture of faith.

The plan of Protestant union in America has had somewhat of a setback in Presbyterian circles, from whence it arose. The Congregationalists may assume its leadership. Of this possibility *The Christian Century* says:

On a mid-winter day nearly three years ago, when the gathering of churchmen at Philadelphia had adopted the plan for an organization look-

ing toward the uniting of the Protestant forces of the United States in one organic body, Dr. Raymond Calkins of Cambrige, Mass., in a speech expressed his regret that his own Congregational denomination would not have a chance to be the first to ratify and adopt the new plan. He made the observation that the general judicatories of practically all the other denominations would be convened before the next session of the Congregational National Council, and while he would rejoice at every favorable reception accorded the new plan, he could wish that his own denomination might have the honor and joy of adopting it first.

After two and a half years that honorable precedence is now within the likely grasp of the Congregational communion. The action taken at the biennial meeting of the council at Los Angeles, last summer, in sending the plan to the state and district associations for their consideration has nearly reached its consummation. A majority of the associations have already approved it and the denomination enters now upon a thoroughgoing discussion looking forward to definite action by the council in 1923. Dr. Frank K. Sanders has contributed a significant and lucid interpretation to *The Congregationalist* in which he declares that if the Philadelphia outline which affords a minimum of beginnings of organic unity is rejected, all talk about organic unity in any fashion is futile.

It is our conviction that the adoption of this proposal by the state associations of the Congregationalists means the beginning of the revival of the ideal of Christian unity. The post-war period has produced the most aggressive and truculent manifestations of sectarianism witnessed in more than a generation. If the National Council shall crown the vote of the associations with a favorable vote of its own, it will mark the turn of the tide back again toward the ideal of that fuller catholic fellowship which prophetic souls in all the churches long to see realized. Representatives of twenty denominations were present at Philadelphia in February, 1920, when the new proposal was formulated. It was a proposal for a form of organic coöperation to include such of the present denominations as wished to join the programme, under the title of "The United Churches of Christ in America." The proposal recognizes the impracticability of reaching organic unity at a single stroke and it provides therefore for the continued autonomy of the participating denominations, all of which, however, agree to make over to "The United Churches" certain functions which they now exercise separately. Among these functions are various forms of social action, educational work, and particularly the administration of the missionary enterprise, both at home and in non-Christian lands. This looks far beyond any plan of comity or federation now in operation. By the passing over of denominational control in the fields specified, the glad beginning of the dissolution of sectarianism would be at hand and the evolution of a united Christendom in organic form would be under way.

The Congregational genius for Christian unity has in this plan an unprecedented chance to set an example before the rest of the Christian groups. Given the spirit and disposition of unity, no one can doubt the desirability and practicable character of the proposal. It is now in the

hands of the judicatories of the denominations whose representatives participated in the preliminary conference. It is understood that when six of these bodies shall approve the plan, it shall become a working reality, and "The United Churches of Christ in America" will begin their programme of unified activity, looking forward to the time when they and other bodies of similar spirit may become "The United *Church* of Christ in America." Those who believe that the greatest weakness of organized Christianity today is found in the church's divisions, will watch with interest the fate of these proposals in the hands of all the Protestant bodies. Already the Methodist Episcopal Church has taken preliminary action by referring the matter to a suitable committee for report at the next general conference three years hence. The Presbyterian Church, itself in a large degree the sponsor of the plan, is thinking over the question, and is apparently unprepared as yet to take action. The greatest hope at present lies in the Congregational National Council. If the plan should be approved, it would doubtless stimulate fresh interest in the proposal on the part of other Christian bodies. No doubt the Disciples, whose heart is right but who lack courage to lead out in the matter of unity, would join them in such action and in not a long time the six bodies requisite for the launching of the united body would be secured.

Forty or more churches in the Middle West met in the Midwest Community Church Conference at Des Moines, Iowa, in May. Commenting on it editorially *The Congregationalist,* Boston, says:

The meeting of the Union Community Churches of the Middle West calls attention to their peculiar problems. These churches have grown out of the evils of sectarianism. Those evils have been unquestioned, and undoubtedly worthy motives have actuated the drawing together of Christians in the community into one church. We trust that we shall not be understood as disparaging in any sense the value of a movement that has already been of great power in many localities, and of favorable influence upon the church-at-large, if we indicate some of the problems and difficulties that appear as the movement becomes extensive. Probably many of these problems are a heritage from the sectarian spirit itself, but they will have to be faced and solved if the beneficial results of a movement with immense capacities for good are not to be lost. If we discuss these problems candidly, it is not without sympathy. We also are among those who are more interested in religion than in denominationalism.

Sometimes it has been found that the federated or independent union church as a remedy for sectarianism is almost as bad as the disease. The federated church, in its efforts to placate all parties, tends to complexity. One such church in Illinois, a federation of a Congregational and a Pres-

byterian organization, maintains both intact, and has a third organization which is called the United Church. Conditions such as this have made the ministers of federated churches wonder where they "get off." The federated church also finds it difficult to adjust its benevolent programme to the satisfaction of all parties, and it not infrequently happens that the division of such funds engenders strife between the members of the different organizations making up the federation. Churches of this type generally lose something of the close supervision and helpful leadership of the denominational life belonging to the national organizations represented in the federation.

The independent union church has been noted for its barrenness in benevolences. The reason for this is obvious. Not only does this type of church fail to have the need of the world brought to it as a demand, but it also fails to get the help and direction that may come from the national denominational life. It is true that the overhead organization of a great denomination may sometimes be a disadvantage to the local church, but in most cases it can be made valuable.

Churches of the independent union, and federated types make the position of the minister somewhat difficult. This is especially true of the former; for its minister really belongs nowhere. Most of the ministers of churches of both types retain their standing in a denomination, but they find it difficult to maintain the full round of fellowship. Kindred problems for the ministry are those of standing and protection. No provision has been made for pensions for pastors of independent churches.

These difficulties have led leaders of union and federated churches to believe that their troubles could be cured by the organization of a national federation of these churches. In this way ministerial standing could, of course, be provided and a benevolence programme arranged. The leaders of the movement came to see, however, that the making of such an organization would in reality be the formation of another denomination so that they would be increasing the ills of sectarianism rather than curing them.

The final solution of the problem will not be found in the federated or independent union community church. These may serve fairly well as a temporary measure, but churches to be permanently successful must have the fellowship, the supervision and the enthusiasm of the larger body, they must find the way to guard ministerial standing and to furnish economic protection for their ministers and they must above all exemplify the sacrificial life in world relationships. When we finally come to organic church union at the top, we shall be able to do away with sectarianism on the field. We can then supervise the exchange of churches between the divisions of the great church army with fairness to all concerned, so that no field will be overchurched and none left without church privileges. The plan presented to the denominations by the Presbyterians two or three years ago, promises most in this regard. We may not be Christian enough to accept it at this time, but by some such method as this we shall finally triumph.

It is characteristic of any great movement that it does not stand alone, but is part of a larger whole, says Bishop Du Vernet writing in the *Montreal Star*. This is true of the strong current which is setting in all over the Christian world towards church union. It is part of a wider movement.

Modern thought demands for the foundation of all our thinking a social idealism which is world-wide in its scope. Not only is an individual as an independent unit known now to be a mere fiction of the brain, but it is also clearly seen now that a nation as an independent unit is something which does not and cannot exist. As the individual is called upon to be a ministering member of a society which ever widens in its scope, so also the nation is called upon to be a ministering member in the society of all nations. In other words, in our thinking we cannot rest until we reach the universal—the society of mankind, where the good of each is the good of all, and the good of all is the good of each. "No man lives to himself." This is the great discovery of social idealism. Equally true is the extension of this fundamental principle—"No nation lives to itself." Mutual service is the law of all membership in universal society.

How can any sectarian church which does not keep the vision of the universal brotherhood of man based upon the universal fatherhood of God ever before it expect to fulfill its divine mission? The Spirit of Christ within us is ever urging us towards this universal fellowship. For this reason anything like bitter sectarianism, no matter how confident it may be of its monopoly of the truth, is the enemy of Christ.

The refinements of theology make no perceptible difference in the characters of men. The Spirit of Christ is the spirit of service, the spirt of sacrifice, the spirit of the Cross. It is this spirit shed abroad in the hearts of men which makes all the difference in the world.

Each branch of the church of Christ thinks that it has something most precious to conserve and pass on as a valuable contribution to the comprehensive church which is yet to be. This is why the Anglican Church at its General Synod recently held emphasized the importance of episcopacy as a link of historic continuity in order to maintain an outward bond of unity, but there can be no question about it that while good and long tested organization is very valuable, what is most vital is the Spirit of Christ within the church. The very conservative churchmen to be found both in the Anglican Church, and also in the Presbyterian Church and others, think that they are doing God service by being loyal to denominational differences, and in so far as they are conserving valuable elements for the reconstructed church of the future this is no doubt true, but there is still an immense amount of unreasonable religious prejudice founded only upon religious fashion which must be swept away by a fresh outpouring of the Spirit of Christ, which is the Spirit of Universal Fellowship.

BOOK REVIEWS

It is always interesting to observe how one's environment gives color to one's outlook. *The Problem of Reunion,* by Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A. (Longmans) is a valuable book, but his church, which is Roman Catholic, looms up as large as the infallible way as Anglicanism would be to most Anglicans or Protestantism to most Protestants. But the book reads well. There are seven chapters as follows: "The Need of Reunion," "The Triple Nature of the Problem," "The Problem of Polity," "The Ambiguity of Anglicanism," "The Reformation and Righteousness," "The Root of Diversity," and "Exclusive Claims, Catholic and Roman." He groups the churches of Christendom into three great divisions: (1) the churches that are in communion with Rome, styled the Catholic Church; (2) the Eastern Churches, most of them orthodox, but some still heretical at least in name; and (3) the Reformed Churches, i. e., those that broke with the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation or later on broke with one another. The necessary steps to reunion are named as follows: (1) the reunion of the Reformed Churches among themselves; (2) the reunion of the latter with the church from which they broke away; and (3) the reunion of the East and the West. The first step toward attaining reunion is realizing its necessity; second, to discover the obstacles; and, third, to remove them. He regards the conference method as unsatisfactory because to him it starts from the *status quo nunc* and ignores the past, from which, however, we would dissent; he advocates going back to the parting of the ways and trying to discover their causes. This precipitates controversy because frequently we are dealing with unreliable data, but there is merit in willingness to cover the whole field from the parting of the ways to the present.

Regarding orders, he insists that episcopacy originated with the apostles themselves, who handed on the plenitude of their sacramental power to such men as Timothy and Polycarp and on to the papacy, and only through such tradition, constant and inviolate, is sacramental power handed down. He argues agaist both Anglicanism and Protestantism with skill and finds corporate guidance as evinced in the works of the church in its unity, catholicity and apostolicity, all of which he argues is fulfilled in the Roman Catholic Church and only in the Roman Catholic Church. It is strictly a denominational argument, setting forth the claims of superiority of the Roman Catholic Church over all others, which an Anglican of the same type of mind would say of Anglicanism or a Protestant of the same type of mind would say of Protestantism. Nevertheless it is a book of merit and his plea for reunion is strong and clear, aside from its sectarian bias. He says, "A host of warring sects each preaching a different Christianity is too great an absurdity to be tolerated for ever, even by illogical man. It has taken centuries for Christendom to realize this absurdity and to draw the obvious inference. But it has done so at last, and for that reason Christianity has never been so discredited as it is at the pres-

ent moment, especially in countries where diversity is most pronounced. Things cannot go on as they are. Either the sects must perish, or they must reunite. Separated from, and at war with, one another, they are an object of scorn and ridicule alike to the intelligent pagan and to the intelligent thinker at home. Reunion alone can save them. Reunion alone can get rid of that contradiction which at present constitutes an insuperable barrier to the acceptance of Christian truth, alone can enable Christianity to stem with success the growing tide of scepticism, rationalism, and indifference. Reunion alone can restore to the churches that grip of the masses which to so large an extent they have lost; alone can enable them effectively to deal with the crying problems of the hour. Reunion alone can furnish missionary effort, so glorious in its aim, with that consistency and unity of organization without which it must ever prove increasingly futile. Reunion alone can give to the scatttered forces of Christianity that power which will enable her to influence governments and move whole nations, and so, by the inherent and compelling excellence of her ideal, constrain them to handle peace and war, capital and labor and poverty, in the Christian and the only reasonable way. To save the divided house of Christianity from yet further disaster, its servants, its members, its children, diverse as they are in blood and mind, must be brought to profess together the same faith, to worship together in the same Spirit, and to labor together in the self-same cause of Christ, their Saviour and Lord. Only in one great world-wide church can Christ's ideal be realized and Christianity faithfully and effectively fulfil her mission on earth.''

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America had its beginning in 1908. It has become one of the chief forces for righteousness, not only in America, but in the world as well. Its ideals have become living realities. The great denominations have found the way to coöperation. Dr. Charles S. Macfarland, its general secretary, tells the story from its foundation period to the present time in a very interesting volume entitled *The Progress of Church Federation to 1922* (Revell). It is an admirable review of the annual and quadrennial records and is so presented as to make them of incalculable value to every student of American Christianity. It is briefly told, but not too briefly. The ample bibliography enables one to study the details of the great work, so that if this volume awakens interest beyond what is herein told, the bibliography will prove satisfactory to every student in research. Federation is a period in Christian unity, and the Federal Council has done a fine, brave work in the leadership of the churches. It has a place so definite in the American church life that there is no other possibility for it but to go forward in its great service.

A constructive word concerning the present situation in Christian unity is spoken in a little book entitled *Impasse or Opportunity?* by Malcolm Spencer, M. A., Secretary of the Student Christian Movement.

The sub-title, The Situation After Lambeth, gives a clue to the author's purpose. He explains in the preface that, "What I have written, I have written under a sense of strong constraint. It has seemed to me that the Lambeth Appeal has opened to the church a door of great opportunity; and no one is hastening to go through. If anything I can say can open that door a little wider, I am bound to say it. I am especially debtor to the cause of Christian unity, for I have had, for a free churchman, unique opportunities of entering intimately into the catholic position." The book is a challenge to both sides and to all not to falter in the face of the difficulties which have come up in connection with the "Appeal" and the "Responses" made to it by the bodies which have considered it, but to take hold of the problem of separation and reunion with greater courage and devotion. In one chapter after another the author gives a helpful kind of "mutual interpretation" of the values of the creeds, orders, sacraments, and experience of religion.

Another interesting and enlightening book which has come forth to speak a word in season by way of interpretation of the Lambeth Appeal is *Lambeth and Reunion*, by the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar, and Hereford. "We have endeavored," they write in the last chapter, "in the preceding chapters to fill in some of the outlines of the Lambeth Appeal, and also to recreate the atmosphere in which it was shaped. This last is all-important, for of necessity the Appeal must be read and criticised in an atmosphere and from a standpoint very different from those in which it came to birth. Moreover we realize how lengthy an education will be required before our own people, not to speak of others, will see it in its true setting and understand its true import." The major interest and concern of these bishops and of their book is of course for the great cause of Christian reunion itself. "Christianity," they affirm, "can supply both the ideal way of life and the spiritual momentum by which man can attain it. But it can only be adequately supplied by the impact on the world of a united church. Therefore the call of the world for the reunion of Christians is one whose solemnity and urgency cannot be put into words. We shall disregard it at our peril."

By far the most delicate subject in Christian unity is the Lord's Supper. It is only when we reach the stage of intercommunion that we in any true sense begin to bear witness to the world of the oneness in Christ. As a contribution to bridge building between the churches on this subject, *Steps Toward Intercommunion: Sacrifice in Holy Communion*, by Douglas S. Guy, B.D., Hon. Canon of Ripon, etc. (W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., Cambridge), is a little book of immense value. Starting with the Scriptures, with painstaking accuracy he gathers his evidence from the apostolic period down to modern times in his argument for the sacrificial nature of the Lord's Supper. He dissents both from the Roman Catholic and from the

Evangelicals (whether attached to the Church of England or to other bodies). There is certainly need of clear thinking on this subject. Evangelical Protestants have dwelt too much on what we receive and not enough on what we have to offer. It would be well if Evangelical Protestants could have a congress on this subject to find where we are. Abuses must not drive us to extremes. Dr. Headlam is quoted as saying, "Just as the Passover was a sacrifice, so this would be one, and being a sacrifice it would be interpreted not in the mediæval manner, but as people at that time thought of sacrifice. * * This new spiritual sacrifice, as we are constantly reminded that it is, would have associated with it all the ideas that had been connected by the Jews with sacrifice. It would be a real act of communion between God and His people, and between those who took part in it. It would be a real partaking of spiritual food, and real sharing in the divine life. * * S. Paul believed that the Christian received spiritual nourishment as the Jews had received it of old; he saw a definite parallel between the Christian communion and the sacrificial meal of the heathen or the Jew; he believed that to the Christian there is a real partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ. * * * In the Christian Church from the beginning two things are clear; the one, that the phrase, 'the Body and Blood of Christ' was taken in a real meaning; and the other, that the Eucharist was from the beginning called a sacrifice. What interpretation was given to the term Sacrifice there may be doubt, for Sacrifice has many meanings. It was always used definitely in a spiritual sense. It was always used in contrast to the material sacrifices of the heathen and Jew, which had come to an end. There was always a belief in the uniqueness of the offering of Christ."

The Constructive Quarterly, New York, for June has an interesting article on "Reunion," by Dr. Gilbert White, Bishop of Willochra, South Australia, also a strong article on "The Corporate Nature of Christianity," by Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, Chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford. *The Christian East*, London, for May contains the outlines of the policy of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, both toward the Anglican communion and toward reunion in general. *The American Church Monthly* for June has a timely editorial note regarding relations between the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches and says, "We suspect that the East is quite as opposed to the claims of the Anglican Church and is quite as ready to repudiate the Anglican theory of the Church as is Rome," hence it calls for official approaches rather than sporadic overtures.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CB

OL. XII NO. 2

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

OCTOBER, 1922

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

WO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.' "—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XII. OCTOBER, 1922 No. 2

CONTENTS

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN UNION 89
By Rev. F. D. Kershner. LL.D., Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.

THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES 100
By Demetrios Simou Balanos (Translated from *Anaplasis*, Athens, by Ralph W. Brown).

CHURCH UNITY, BEING THE REPORT OF A JOINT CONFERENCE HELD RECENTLY AT LAMBETH PALACE . 106

SOME THOUGHTS ON UNITY—A STATEMENT 115
By Professor Francis J. Hall, D.D., General Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN REUNION FROM THE QUAKER POINT OF VIEW 127
By Edward Grubb, Letchworth, England

SOME THOUGHTS FROM MAIN STREET CONCERNING CHURCH UNION 138
By Rev. Fred Smith, Pastor Pilgrim Congregational Church, Carthage, S. D.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 145

LETTER TO THE EDITOR 155

BOOKS REVIEWS 157

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR JULY, 1922

FROM UNIFORMITY THROUGH DIVERSITIES TO COMPREHENSION 9
By Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., New Haven, Conn.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST AND THE KINGDOM . . 13
By Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D., Minister Central Church of Disciples, New York City.

A HALF-CENTURY EXPERIMENT IN INTERDENOMINATIONAL COÖPERATION AND ITS FAILURE 30
By Julia Pettee, New York City.

CHRISTIAN UNION—SOME OF THE GREATEST OBSTACLES 48
By Rev. J. H. Garrison, LL.D., Los Angeles, Calif.

APPROACHES BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN AND SWEDISH EPISCOPATES 60
By Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., Editor Christian Work, New York City.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 66

BOOK REVIEWS 77

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price **$2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.**

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Washington, D. C., 1925. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1923 or 1924. Archbishop of Uppsala, president; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

A LITANY FOR UNITY

From arrogance and impatience; from wilful misunderstanding of each other's difficulties; from all want of kindness and of charity,

Good Lord, deliver us.

From worldliness and blindness of heart; from envy and strife and whatever may hinder us from godly union and concord,

Good Lord, deliver us.

From unwillingness to confess our faults; from blindness to the virtues of others; from indifference to the evil of a divided Christendom,

Good Lord, deliver us.

From failure to recognize the work of thy Holy Spirit wherever He may please to dwell; from want of faith and confidence, from hopelessness and despair,

Good Lord, deliver us.

That it may please thee to enable us seriously to take to heart the great dangers which we are in through our unhappy divisions and to strive to draw nearer to each other in thee and for thee,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to pour out upon us the spirit of earnest prayer and supplication, that we may be fitted and prepared to do thy holy will,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to restore the visible unity of thy church, broken by our sin,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to grant us patience to understand the difficulties of those who are separated from us and readiness to appreciate the truths for which they stand,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to show us how to give up whatever is sectarian in our contentions and to give of the truth which thou hast revealed to us,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to grant us the grace of perseverance, that we may not be discouraged by the many difficulties which the study of Christian differences reveals,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to move men's hearts with a greater desire for unity, that at last there may be one flock as there is one Shepherd.

—*The Churchman, New York.*

A PRAYER

ALMIGHTY Father, Who hast set us to break down the walls that divide, have mercy upon us because we have turned aside to build up the walls. Make us to see our sin and give us grace whereby we may be able to do Thy will. By our wall building we have hindered Christ in His work of salvation. Make us no longer afraid of ourselves or the past; grant that we may live with our faces turned in friendly attitude toward all who call Thee Father; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

LOVE IS THE ONLY TIE

Paul said that nothing shall be able to separate "*us,*" not *me,* from the love of God. The Christian tie is not an individual tie, but a fraternal tie. It is a tie that binds Christians together, and thus united they are united to God. No Christian can separate himself from his brethren, and claim an individual tie with God. "For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen." Love is the only influence in the world that can bring people together and keep them together. Love is the only tie that can keep a home together, and it is the only tie that can keep a Church together. Many Christians have trusted a common faith to keep them together. They believed the same things, and they trusted this tie to keep them together in the bond of peace; but it failed. A common faith, however strong, cannot maintain the bond of Christian brotherhood. Only a common love can do this. The strong heat of a fervent common love is the only influence that can melt and unite human hearts in a lasting bond of Christian unity; but this, as stated by Paul, can and will unite all Christians that allow the love of God to have its way in their hearts and over their lives.—*Rev. John B. Cowden in "Christian Worship," West Nashville, Tenn.*

UNITY AND COURAGE

WE have talked Christian unity for a long time. Is it not here and now that we should practice it? It requires courage to leave our accustomed denominational traditions, but they have got to be left behind for the things that are common to all Christians. Not this or that or the other, but love, is the sign of Christian life. Who is courageous enough to practice it?

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN UNION

Those who are disappointed because of the apparently slow progress which has been made toward Christian union have, in most cases, underestimated the difficulties which the problem involves. Abstractly considered, union is becoming more and more the passionate desire of the vast majority of Christians, but when it comes to making practical advances in the direction of greater unity, only the most timid and halting steps can be taken. And yet, this anomalous and somewhat disappointing situation is, after all, only what the student of religious history should expect. It may help to stimulate optimism on the part of some of us who occasionally need it if we keep in mind the nature of the difficulties which confront us in our efforts to bring peace and harmony into the nominally Christian world.

I

The first consideration which we should always have before us is the record of the past nineteen centuries of Christian history. It is as utterly hopeless to gain any true appreciation of what is involved in the reunion of Christendom without a pretty thorough knowledge of this history as it would be to try to teach a language without knowing its alphabet. Organized Christianity, as we find it to-day, is the resultant of numberless forces and influences which must be taken into account if we are to understand the tremendous problem involved in reunion. To review these forces in even the most casual way is, of course, out of the question in a paper like this, but a few of the more serious items may be indicated as illustrative of the rest. Let us take, for example, the early cleavage between the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman ideals of church polity.

When the first church was organized after the Forty Days its members were all Jews. They had back of them the Old Testament Scriptures and the inherited peculiarities of the Israelite as well as the presence of the new Spirit which gave vitality to their faith. As Christianity to their minds was a species of reformed Judaism they were at no pains to throw away their ancestral customs. Most of them practiced circumcision, offered sacrifices in the Temple, kept the Jewish Sabbath along with the Christian Sunday, and in countless other respects manifested their Hebrew origin. It was in this way that the first serious schism in Christianity came about. Paul's "Judaizers" were simply the original orthodox Jerusalem Christians who insisted upon everybody's believing as they did in order to be reckoned as followers of Christ. The Apostle of Tarsus in opposing them did not dispute their technical orthodoxy but claimed that their narrowness of vision had made it impossible for them to comprehend the fundamental doctrine of their Master.

Paul himself might have been a Judaizer had it not been for circumstances. His conversion to the larger outlook apparently dates from his missionary experience. When he journeyed through Asia Minor he came everywhere in contact with the Greek city civilization and most of his converts were Gentiles with a distinctly Hellenic background. These people interpreted the Christian message as the Jews had done, in the light of their own environment and needs. They saw no use in circumcision, they knew nothing and cared nothing about the Jewish rites or customs, they believed in the democratic polity of the Greek City states instead of the Sanhedrin oligarchy of the Jews. Hence the churches which they built up were anything but identical with the early Judean congregations. It is true that they possessed a common spirit and practiced certain rites in common

(Baptism and the Lord's Supper) but there were many other respects in which they differed. They did submit to the synagogue method of government by elders although the prevalent Greek and Jewish conceptions of the office were doubtless far from identical. In any event, there was difference enough to cause the Jewish zealots to stigmatize the Galatian Gentile Christians as without the pale of the real church. It is the supreme mark of Paul's greatness that he rose above his Jewish training and environment and took the stand for Christian freedom which he embodied in the Epistle to the Galatians.

Greek Christianity developed more and more away from the older Jewish models until the latter gradually became a separate sect called the Ebionites. Of course some of the Jewish churches amalgamated with the Greeks but the distinctly Hebrew group drew back farther and farther to the right until they finally lost step entirely with their brethren and disappeared. In the meantime, the Greek churches were finding problems of their own in their efforts to preserve their independence from the overpowering influence of Rome. The germ of the age-long contest between East and West in the history of the church is to be found almost at the beginning of the apostolic period. The Greek ideal was democratic, speculative, and predominantly liberty loving in every particular; the Roman ideal was imperialistic, practical and preferred order and efficiency to freedom. That such a situation should produce a clash was inevitable, and while the modern Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox communions do not fully embody the two ideals mentioned, for there is much of the Greek speculation in Rome and much of the Roman imperialism in the East, yet the general distinction obtains. Moreover, with the collapse of the Russian Empire it is not improb-

able that Greek orthodoxy will return more and more to the traditional democracy of its earlier heritage. In any event, the conflict between the Latin conception of Christian polity and the Greek ideal is basic and fundamental. It is at the heart of the almost anarchic separatism of certain Protestant communions and it is the real explanation of the unbending aloofness of the Vatican.

This paper does not intend to infer that a chasm so broad as the one between the Latin and the Greeks ideals of government cannot be bridged. Doubtless it can and must be in the strength of true Christian faith and forbearance but it is useless to deny the serious difficulties which such a problem involves.

II

The general cleavage involved in the Hebrew, Greek and Roman ideals of worship and polity has been further augmented by the historical features dating from the era of the Protestant Reformation. Protestantism, from the beginning, emphasized distinctly national ideals, and as a result increased the spirit of separatism. The earlier lines of cleavage, while basic and fundamental, had about them certain universal characteristics which ran counter to any extreme form of individualism. Both Greek and Roman orthodoxy claim the adjective "catholic" as their heritage and there is much to support their claims. Protestantism, however, developed along the lines of extreme individualism and particularistic freedom rather than along the more universal and catholic channels of orthodoxy. From the very beginning the Protestant churches stressed the ideal of freedom to the neglect of the ideal of unity. They adapted church forms and requirements to national needs and in this way made inevitable the constantly increasing spirit of sectarianism. For state churches to unite without the state forces themselves uniting was, of course, an impossibility and hence for a

large part of the Protestant world any idea of church unity became an irridescent dream.

It may be well to note how this particularistic development was illustrated in the careers of some of the Protestant reformers. Martin Luther himself was unquestionably swayed, both consciously and unconsciously, by considerations of state policy, in working out his church programme. One need not seriously criticize him on this account because he no doubt felt that the salvation of his movement depended upon the support which it received from the princes of his native land. In order to insure this support it was inevitable that the church should adapt herself to the fundamental requirements of national policy. Any other course of procedure would have alienated the only powers which could successfully compete with the absolutism of the papacy. Luther was in a position where his only chance for success appeared to lie in the furtherance of the spirit of nationalism and in the support of the state power in its struggle with the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome. In the judgment of many historians, Luther's treatment of the Anabaptists constitutes one of the least defensible features of his career. It is of course impossible to prove any causal connection between the demands of the state and the theological attitude of the great reformer in this or in other similar instances, but the careful student cannot avoid feeling that there is a presumption, at least, in favor of such a connection. In any event, there can be no doubt concerning a general effort toward the harmonization of ecclesiastical and political considerations in the history of the Lutheran movement from the beginning.

The other state churches of Protestantism parallel in their development the history of Lutheranism. There is a good deal of the political element in the Genevan history of John Calvin and the followers of Knox were frequently quite as much political as they were ecclesias-

tical martyrs. In Sweden and Holland and other European countries, the same rule obtained. Protestantism became uniformly the ally of the state and was of inestimable service in stiffening the morale of national resistance to outside imperialism. Perhaps the best illustration of this fact is found in the resistance of the Protestant forces of England in the days of Queen Elizabeth to the invasion of the Spanish Armada. Nationalism and Protestantism worked hand in hand to repel the Spaniards and the new church order justified itself as an indispensable adjunct of the rising national power.

It should be understood, in connection with what has been written, that no impeachment of the essential idealism of Protestantism has been either involved or intended. The Protestant churches, in every case, arose from purely idealistic motives and there was no thought of political expediency as a primary consideration. The Protestant leaders were dominated by an apostolic conscientiousness in the proclamation of the gospel. The fact that the new-born spirit of nationalism became the natural ally of the new reformation in religion does not in the least invalidate the high moral purpose of the early reformers. What we are interested in here is the fact that these separate national developments, of necessity, both produced and accentuated the religious cleavage of the day. As the new states of the modern world multiplied and as the spirit of national rivalry increased, religious separatism and sectarianism were emphasized and men tended to grow more and more apart in their religious views. When they emigrated from the parent countries to a new land, as they did in the case of the United States of America, they brought with them their separatistic views upon religion. As a result, denominationalism manifested itself to an unusual degree in the progress of American history. In the older lands there was homogeneity of religious faith, due to the very fact

that the state and church were united. When citizens from these different countries, however, emigrated to the new world, they produced a heterogeneous religious atmosphere which was unique in human history. It was this conglomeration of adherents of state religions, working in combination with the rising tide of skepticism, which characterized the latter part of the eighteenth century, that was chiefly responsible for the orthodox American doctrine of the separation of church and state. In the older European countries Protestant separatism assumed a more unitary form within the state itself through its amalgamation with the secular power. In America, where no such amalgamation exists, the denominational order stands out in the boldest possible relief. Hence, no doubt, arises the special emphasis upon Christian unity which has grown up in the field of American Protestantism.

It is easy to see that in the development of modern Protestantism there have been historical forces which have necessarily produced divergent types of religious thought. As a result, people are born into the Lutheran family, or the Reformed family, or into some other religious group with an historical background so definite and pronounced as to make agreement between them, or between the representatives of other religious families, exceedingly difficult. No other situation could possibly obtain under the normal operation of the laws of heredity and environment. In order to secure unity under such conditions, almost superhuman efforts must be made by all who are concerned to the end that they may rise above the essentially local and particularistic features of their religious heritage.

III

Aside from the historical element as an explanation of the divisions of Christendom, we must also take into ac-

count the psychological motive. Men think differently upon the same question even when products of almost the same historical environment. Members of the same family frequently differ in their religious views and it is not easy to secure uniform thinking upon any subject, no matter how carefully the avenues of information are guarded. In the exceedingly difficult field of church polity, some people appear, as a certain writer has said, "to be born monarchists, democrats or communists." The same thing is true with regard to the presence or absence of the tendency toward mysticism. The two Newman brothers illustrate how wide this diversity of religious attitude may be in the same family group. Of course the psychologist can account for the divergence by referring it to the operation of distinct causal laws but this explanation does not, in the slightest degree, affect the fact. Humanly speaking, it is impossible and probably it would be exceedingly undesirable to so train all of the individuals of any one group that they would think alike upon all subjects. In the play of individuality, man finds his most precious heritage and however valuable unified thought may be, it is too high a price to pay for it if one has to suppress the very springs of personality.

Another characteristic which modern psychological analysis has brought to the front is the play of what may be styled "unconscious motives" in the formulation of mental decisions. Nothing is more common than for people to deceive themselves with regard to the motives which influence their actions. What we fondly regard as the highest altruism is often the real product of subconscious selfishness. Alleged causes are frequently fallacious, although they may appear to our own souls to be genuine. It requires the closest introspection and the rarest discriminative faculty to separate what is false from what is true in cases of this kind. It is just here

that the problem of conscience becomes so difficult. Our consciences are largely fashioned by these subconscious influences. As a result, we conscientiously differ from those who belong to another religious group and are likely to continue to do so. We dare not become unconscientious in order to secure unity and if we remain conscientious there appears to be no other option than to remain in a state of separatism. It is true that when we come to understand the real psychological basis which lies back of our conscientious differences we can understand the reason for our divergence of belief. With this knowledge before us, the task of reconciliation ought not to be hopeless. Without such knowledge, however, so-called conscientious differences are likely to continue to be a hopeless barrier in the pathway of Christian unity.

IV

We have done no more than to sketch a few of the most obvious causes of religious separatism as it exists throughout the world to-day. From what has been written, however, it will readily be seen that the problem of Christian union is, and must continue to be, an exceedingly complex and difficult one. It is useless to say that the present situation might have been obviated if there had been no apostasy from the original Christian ideal. Whatever might have come to pass under other conditions is of little practical concern. The all-important consideration with us is how we may make the most of the situation as it is. Without attempting to dogmatize, the writer would suggest a few principles which would seem to be fundamental in guiding any lasting progress toward Christian union.

The first and primary fact which demands emphasis in preparing the way for unity is a frank recognition of the scientific causes of separation. So long as we all

believe that our individual religious convictions are directly infallible and heaven-born, there is not the slightest prospect that we shall ever get together. When we are willing to recognize, however, that all of our views are the product of historical and psychological forces which have made us what we are, at least so far as our theological heritage is concerned, we are already on the highway toward a better understanding. This recognition of the scientific basis of all sectarian views is fundamental if any sort of unity is to be secured in the religious world.

Another essential in the development of a permanent spirit of unity is the recognition of the ideal of love or brotherhood as fundamental in the structure of Christianity. In the last analysis, whatever permanently destroys the spirit of brotherhood must be unchristian, no matter how fair-seeming may be the theological garments which it wears. If we recognize this principle and make an honest effort to live up to it; of necessity, the cause of union must some day triumph both in our own hearts and throughout the world. Until all Christians realize that love is the one essential dogma of their faith, the progress toward unity will be slow. The chief difficulty at present lies not so much in any theoretical denial of the supremacy of love as in its practical nullification, as a result of our every day emphasis upon competing motives. Sectarian ambition, material needs, party shibboleths, and a thousand and one other motives are allowed to stand in the way of the immediate recognition of the ideal of brotherhood. Until we can get rid of these things, we shall never have the grace to achieve that perfect oneness of spirit which our Master invoked for His disciples.

Another important consideration, and it must be the final one in this paper, toward preparing the way for Christian unity is the necessity for practicing such points

of agreement as we now possess. We gain in understanding and in sympathy by putting into practice all of the unity which we can conscientiously manifest at any given time. This is the value of all schemes for coöperation, federation and the like. Such efforts are not at all ideal from the point of view of Christian union but they may prove exceedingly valuable in promoting the way toward a better understanding of the causes of separatism and a more earnest effort in the direction of real union.

The pathway toward perfection is difficult and the achievement of progress in any worthy direction is both painful and slow. It is not surprising that these characteristics are present in the most important field of Christian idealism. As another has said, "Far off like a perfect pearl we can discern the City of God. It is so wonderful that it seems as though a child could reach it in a summer's day. But ages pass and it remains faraway, distant, unattained * * * * * Still must we keep our eyes fixed upon the Gate which is called Beautiful even though we stumble many times in the mire and oft in the mists go astray."

F. D. Kershner.

Drake University,
Des Moines, Iowa.

A PRAYER

Be near to every needy soul this day!
Be greater than their greatest need, we pray!
Come closer than their need to all
Who from their depths upon Thee call!
May every soul turn unto Thee
At once in its extremity,
And find in Thee a friend indeed,
Who will supply its every need.

—*John Oxenham.*

THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES

(Translated from *Anaplasis*, Athens, by Ralph W. Brown)

Ever since the schism of the churches occurred in the ninth century, at every difficult juncture in our national life the union of the churches has been proposed as a panacea, sometimes by our own people and sometimes by foreigners, not from purely religious zeal but because of political considerations and interests. It would be a long task to enumerate all the attempts at union which have been made from then till now. It was thus a matter of course that in the last few years, when the welfare of our nation has been in extreme danger, the efforts for unity should have been resumed in the hope that in our struggle for the resoration of our race we might find support in ecclesiastical union with strong nations.

In my judgment, this notion of pursuing unity for political reasons is based upon wholly wrong ideas. If in earlier centuries, when religion played a much more important part in the life of nations, it exercised no real influence, or very little, upon political affairs, and if powers which vaunted themselves as protectors of Christians did not hesitate to ally themselves with the Crescent against fellow-Christians in so far as it served their interests to do so, what shall we say to-day, when political considerations alone dictate the policy of the powers?

What instance can be adduced from the history of recent years, wherein any religious motive has contributed in the slightest degree to the settlement of a political issue?

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that while the responsible governments regulate the relations between the powers, religious relations and questions (since these belong to the sphere of the soul and feeling, and concern even the least citizen) can be regulated by the govern-

ment or the hierarchy only in so far as the whole body of the church concurs. Religious questions are not settled by compulsion or by pressure, by diplomatic concessions or from interested motives. History, and particularly the history of the Florentine Synod, shows how impossible or at best ephemeral is their settlement by such factors. Union from calculation is not real union, but only union on paper, and therefore transitory like all paper structures.

* * * * *

However, besides those who seek unity for political reasons, there are those who labor for it from purely religious motives, in the desire to contribute to the accomplishment of Christ's words: *And there shall be one flock and one shepherd.* But is union of the churches in the proper meaning of the word union, possible? As is well known, the churches are separated by differences of dogma, administration and liturgy.

Though the modern mind pays little heed and takes scant interest in dogmatic questions, those questions are interwoven with the traditions of so many centuries that only long-continued systematic efforts for reconcilement could raise men's spirits above the diversity of dogmatic formulae. Take for example the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost. That question really occupies the attention of the present generation very little, and yet the conferences in recent years of prelates and theologians of the various churches on behalf of union have shown how difficult would be a real agreement on that point, which continues in importance even now, bound up as it is with ancient traditions of each church.

Would it be any easier to reach agreement with regard to the Holy Eucharist, concerning which the various conceptions of the several churches gave rise in past centuries to so many spiritual and material conflicts? And how could the doctrines of the Western Church as to the in-

fallibility of the Pope, the Immaculate Conception, and Purgatory, permit union with that church? Is there any notion on our part that the Western Church would renounce those doctrines? Is it possible to remove so easily the differences in administration of the various churches as these bodies have taken form in the course of the centuries? Would the Pope give up so readily his privileges so hardly won, or would the other churches recognize them? With the several churches so different in their administration, how could their assimilation come about?

But the thing that would give rise to the greatest difficulties in the way of union is precisely that which many persons consider the simplest matter, namely the differences in worship.

The great masses of church people do not consist of "intellectuals" who subject everything to the test of strict logic. They cling fast to worship, which is the part of religion that specially falls within their comprehension. The multitude is for the most part very sensitive as to everything about external worship, and in that field any concession or concordat would be impossible. So how could union come to pass, for instance, between a church which paid honor to the saints and their icons, and a church which honored neither? As our national historian Constantine Paparrhegopoulos rightly says, wise men who consider such questions of no moment "may know many things, but are unaware that a few learned persons do not constitute a nation; they are unaware that all the nations were not created uniformly; and above all, they do not know the southern people's sensitive heart and its secrets whereby our religion was led to lay that bridge which leads them from earth to heaven . . . The men of the north, in whom the logical faculty surpasses the imaginative, and who are less subject to the influence of the world of sensation around

them, need nothing of an intermediary sort for them to enter into touch with God. But those who live in the south, with their livelier imagination and more emotional heart, are so constituted that they must have certain intimate sensations whereby to ascend, as by a ladder, to the supreme being.''

Thus each church in its dogmatic, administrative and liturgical aspects has had its own particular development, a development closely connected and interwoven with the national and intellectual life at large of each separate people and their national traditions. The union of the churches, which presupposes mutual concessions, would involve disavowal of traditions to which an ethnic character must be ascribed. From that standpoint, union of the churches, in the real meaning of the term, is impossible, at least for the mentality of to-day which clings so fast to what is racial and traditional—as impossible as the union of diverse races into one; and all the efforts which are being made in that spirit are destined to sure failure just as they have failed in the past.

* * * * * *

But in the same degree that union of the churches, rightly speaking, is impossible, fellowship of the churches based on love would be possible, easy and desirable.* For the achievement of such fellowship, annual gatherings of the prelates and theologians of the various churches would be very helpful. Effort should there be made to heighten the points and tendencies which the churches have in common, and to smooth their differences and misunderstandings, removing them so far as

**Translator's note.*—For Balanos, union properly defined would require complete dogmatic, administrative and liturgical agreement. Similarly the Archbishop of Nubia declares complete dogmatic union to be the only possible, right and effective kind (*Christian Union Quarterly,* Jan., 1922, pp. 194-215). Like the Metropolitan, Balanos abandons the hope of present union in favor of intercourse and fellowship in love. But in sharpest contrast with the Metropolitan, Balanos goes on to contemplate with longing a close deep unity in diversity, from a standpoint quite like that of the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, insisting throughout, however, that such unity or fellowship is one thing, while union properly speaking (the one great ideal of Nubia) is something different and impossible. Here we can only wait for further explanations.

possible. Discussion in those gatherings should, of course, proceed without prejudice or passion, and the results should be made known to the great masses of the laity by publications and addresses, for it must be emphasized that true fellowship of the churches cannot come about by agreements on the part of prelates and theologians, except as its meaning and its benefits are understood and embraced by the whole body.

In that way in time, understanding would come of the historic reasons for the various divisions, and this would bring about respect for opposed opinions and differing customs. The hierarchy, theologians and members of the various churches would be known to one another, and would come to be mutually respected and esteemed as members of the same fellowship in Christ, and to regard the place where persons of another form of faith hold worship as a house of God, their sacraments as holy, their ministers as commissioned of the Lord. Thus gradually the true brotherhood of the whole Christian body would be built up, above the differences of the several confessions, and a new period of Christianity would dawn, a period of true vigor and glory, in which Christian forces would no longer be worn down to no purpose in useless domestic contests, but Christianity with concentrated powers unhampered by internal strife would fight the good fight for the prevalence of truth and justice in the world. Then the words of our Lord would be fulfilled: *One flock and one shepherd.** Christendom in its entirety, united in a spirit of love, will form the flock under the Chief Shepherd, the church's heavenly Spouse.

But we see many puzzled faces, and hear the query, What could *one flock* mean, with dogmatic, administrative, liturgical differences among its members? And we reply, Just as likeness in externals is not requisite for

*Translator's note.—The union of the churches is excluded from these possibilities in the writer's thought, as will appear. Compare this with the Anglican outlook.

the sheep of the flock, so too the oneness of the spiritual flock does not presuppose as indispensable external uniformity, and common accord upon all points, mere lip-agreement, but requires an internal bond, the unitive bond of love which the Saviour said is the only sign by which His disciples may be known.

If among the apostles themselves each had his own way of thinking, and if Paul for instance had a religious nature different from Peter's, though both were inspired of the same Spirit and warmed by the same faith in Christ, how would it be possible to-day, when the appropriation of religious truths for almost any cultured man is not quite free from the influence of his own subjectivity, how would it be possible really to demand identity of conceptions and customs in every respect among the various churches?

Let us turn away from the utopias of church union, each of which in century after century has pursued the same course for the attainment of full accord upon all dogmatic, administrative and liturgical points. Let us not deceive ourselves with the vain idea that all peoples will embrace the doctrines and traditions of our church and disavow their own. And let us all work as best we can, without egotism or ulterior design, for the achievement of the fellowship of the churches in love, in order that one spirit of true brotherhood may prevail, over and above individual differences, and that thus the Saviour's prayer to His heavenly Father may be fulfilled, when He prayed *That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.*

Demetrios Simou Balanos.

CHURCH UNITY

Being the Report of a Joint Conference Held Recently at Lambeth Palace

THE time has, in our opinion, come when it is desirable that information should be made public as to the present outcome in this country of the "Appeal to All Christian People," which was issued nearly two years ago by the bishops attending the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

The Appeal was transmitted by the Archbishop of Canterbury in August, 1920, to the different Christian churches at home and abroad. On September 28th, 1920, a provisional statement in reply was issued by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England at their annual meeting, and was endorsed by the National Free Church Council. In April, 1921, a fuller statement from the same source was published under the title, "The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal," and in September, 1921, as the result of detailed examination and discussion, the following resolution was passed:

"The Federal Council, having noted the suggestion of the bishops that a central conference should be held between representatives of episcopal and non-episcopal communions upon the whole subject of the Appeal, and further desiring explication of expressions in the Appeal which are felt to have an ambiguous character, hereby appoints the following with a view to such Conference with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they may appoint: *Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., D.D. (Moderator); Rev. Charles Brown, D.D.; Rev. W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.; Sir Walter Essex; Rev. W. Y. Fullerton; *Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.; Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A.; Sir Alfred Pearce Gould,

K.C.V.O., M.S.; Rev. A. J. Viner; Rev. S. Horton; Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., B.D.; *Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D.; Right Rev. Bishop Mumford; Rev. T. Nightingale; *Professor A. S. Peake, M.A., D.D.; Rev. Alex. Ramsay, D.D.; Right Hon. Walter Runciman; Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.; Rev. J. Alfred Sharp; *Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A., D.D.; Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P.; Rev. Henry Smith; Rev. W. Lewis Robertson, M.A., Rev. Walter H. Armstrong, and *Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, M.A., D.D., secretaries."

With a view to the desired Conferences, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York nominated as representatives of the Church of England the Archbishop of Canterbury, *the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, *Gloucester, Ely, Lichfield, *Peterborough, Chelmsford, Hereford, and *Ripon. *The Bishop of Salisbury was subsequently added, together with *Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity of Oxford, and *Dr. Walter Frere.

On November 30th, 1921, the Conference met at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and after prolonged discussion appointed a committee of thirteen persons (six Church of England and six Free Churchmen) to consider, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, some of the issues involving large questions of principle which had been raised during the Conference. The names of those who formed the committee are marked with an asterisk in the foregoing lists. This committee held prolonged meetings in Lambeth Palace in January, March, and April, 1922, giving consideration chiefly to the three following subjects: (1) The nature of the church; (2) The nature of the ministry; (3) The place of creeds in a united church. The committee ultimately decided to present

their report in the form of a series of propositions to which they had unanimously agreed. The Conference met at Lambeth Palace on May 24th, 1922, to receive the report. The report was considered, and after full discussion the Conference unanimously gave its general approval to the several propositions in the form printed below.

The report must be submitted to the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, at whose request the Conference was arranged. But the members of the Conference who represent that Council concurred with the representatives of the Church of England in deciding that, without prejudice to any decision of the Council, the report should at once be made public for the information of the churches represented in the Conference and of all Christian people. It will be understood that the propositions which the report contains are not intended as a complete statement of the great subjects with which they deal; nor even as expressing what individual members of the Conference or the churches which they represent might regard as a full statement of their own positions. They are submitted simply as expressing substantially the very large measure of agreement which, after full and frank discussion, the Conference had been enabled to reach.

It is obvious that many matters of great importance are not dealt with in this interim report. These must be the subject of future discussion. But the members of the Conference hope that the agreement which they have so far reached may prove to be a basis upon which, by God's help, further agreement leading to practical action may be built. Meanwhile, we would earnestly press upon all who have this great matter at heart that they should remember steadily, both in public and private prayer, the possibilities which, as we believe, God is opening to our

view, in firm assurance that He will, in His own good time, show us the manner of their accomplishment.

RANDALL CANTUAR:
COSMO EBOR:
J. D. JONES, *Moderator of the Federal Council.*

May 29th, 1922.

THE REPORT AS ACCEPTED BY THE CONFERENCE

I.—ON THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

1. The foundation of the church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative will of God.

2. The church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one life in Him, so there is and can be but one church.

4. This one church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its one life in Christ, one.

5. This visible church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible church it must possess certain visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the apostles at least the following: (a) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ; (b) the

observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; (c) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline; (d) a ministry, representative of the church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the church's witness and work. (See II, 1.)

7. Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the church.

8. The church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the church and local churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the churches are the local representatives of the one church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the purpose of Christ, and every endeavor ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterize the church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degrees of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible church, they cannot be considered as all alike giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's mind and purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that church. But such judgments, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the divine mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the

visible church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole church as the One Body of the redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgment can only be given by the all-knowing mind and sovereign mercy of God.

II.—The Ministry

1. A ministry of the Word and Sacrament is a divine ordinance for the church, and has been since the days of the apostles an integral part of its organized life.

2. It is a ministry within the church exercising representatively, in the name and by the authority of the Lord Who is the Head of the church, the powers and functions which are inherent in the church.

3. It is a ministry of the church, and not merely of any part thereof.

4. No man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the church, acting through those who have authority given to them in the church to confer it. There must be not only an inward call of the Spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the church.

5. It is in accordance with apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the church that this commission should be given through ordination, with prayer and the laying-on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain.

6. We believe that in ordination, together with this commission to minister, divine grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed.

7. Within the many Christian communions into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to

the circumstances of these several communions and their beliefs as to the mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of "enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints." But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the united church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the united church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the united church.

10. The acceptance of episcopal ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise re-

ceived, which have, together with those received by episcopal ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

III.—The Place of the Creed in a United Church

1. In a united church there must be unity of faith, which implies both the subjective element of personal adhesion and an objective standard of truth.

2. The supreme standard of truth is the revelation of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as summed up in Jesus Christ.

3. As the church in its corporate capacity confesses Christ before men, there should be in the united church a formal statement of its corporate faith in Christ as an expression of what is intellectually implied by its confession of Him.

4. The creed commonly called Nicene should be accepted by the united church as the sufficient statement of this corporate faith. The manner and occasions in which the creed is to be used should be determined by the united church.

5. With regard to a confession of faith at Baptism, the united church would be justified in using the creed which has been for centuries the Baptismal Creed of the Western Church, commonly called the Apostles' Creed. Its use at Baptism would imply recognition of the corporate faith of the church therein expressed as the guide and inspiration of the Christian life.

6. The use of the creeds liturgically in the public worship of the church should be regarded as an expression of corporate faith and allegiance; and the united church should be prepared to recognize diversities of use in this as in other liturgical customs.

7. When assent to the creeds is required by the united church, such assent should not be understood to imply

the acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian faith, or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation. It should be understood to imply the acceptance of them as agreeable to the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, as affirming essential elements in the Christian faith, and as preserving that faith in the form in which it has been handed down through many centuries in the history of the Christian church.

8. While we thus recognize the rightful place of the creeds in the united church, we also recognize most fully and thankfully the continued presence and teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body, and emphasize the duty of the church to keep its mind free and ready to receive from Him in each day and generation ever-renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth.

THINGS ETERNAL

"Stronger than steel
Is the sword of the Spirit;
Swifter than arrows
The light of the truth is,
Greater than anger
Is love, and subdueth.
The dawn is not distinct,
Nor is the night starless,
Love is eternal!
God is still God, and
His faith shall not fail us,
Christ is eternal."

—*Selected.*

SOME THOUGHTS ON UNITY— A STATEMENT

The aim of this statement is to make clear the standpoint from which I am answering certain letters *in re* the volume designated below. It consists of three parts: (a) A review of certain contents of the said volume; (b) Determinative elements in the Catholic point of view with regard to the problem of visible unity; (c) Definitions of certain terms concerning which a better mutual understanding is desirable.

I. *Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities*, by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Association Press, N. Y., 1921.

This volume is a most valuable exhibition of the various aspects of the problem of unity as seen from the Protestant standpoint. Its general tone is admirable; and while it confirms my previous impressions in the main, it presents the whole subject in a comprehensive and clear way that I find most helpful in my effort to understand more adequately the bearings of the present situation as scholarly Protestants regard them. While I am unable to accept its standpoint, and believe that certain of its statements need important revision, I rejoice to find that I heartily agree with much of its content.

(a) I agree that, fuller coöperation and, as between communions whose vital principles are not fundamentally discordant, corporate union, should be actively promoted, without waiting for the slower development of plans for more comprehensive unification. To the extent permitted by the positive principles (as distinguished from traditional *sentiments* of the several bodies concerned, I believe that full and effective federation between non-episcopal bodies should be pushed on, coupled with the aim of gradually converting it into corporate union—union which will completely merge its partici-

pant denominations into one denomination. It would greatly clarify the problem of ecumenical unification, if the existing Christian bodies could be reduced to two (Pan-Protestant and Pan-Catholic); and minor unifications within each of these two groups would undoubtedly constitute genuine steps towards the larger consummation.

(b) I agree that, in spite of existing divisions, there is to-day one great Catholic Church. But I cannot describe it as "invisible." It consists, the New Testament being witness, of all *baptized Christians* of whatever name. That is, baptism determines its visible boundary. Moreover, even now there exists a true organic unity of this great church, although it has been removed from general observation by discordant corporate organizations and allegiances, and by mutually inconsistent faiths and orders connected therewith. The problem of unity is to correct these mutual discordances and inconsistencies, to renew visible conformity of life and functioning in all parts of the church, and thus to *make visible and fruitful* the unity of that Body of Christ which was originally created and vitalized by the Holy Spirit and was intended to continue forever.

(c) The acknowledgment by the Lambeth Conference that all the baptized are members of the one catholic church was not new, as this volume seems to say. It is found in the Declaration on Unity put forth by the American bishops in 1886, and is a truism of catholic theology. For us the real issue *ad rem* lies in the discordant attitudes of members of the catholic church towards its ministry and towards its faith and order at large. We distinguish sharply between the extent of the church or individual membership therein, grounded in Baptism, and the relation of organized societies *as such* to the organic structure of the Body of Christ. It

is in the latter field that the problem of visible unity arises, in our view.

(d) I cannot accept the historic survey of schisms in the ancient church as giving justly proportionate perspectives. There were then, and, human nature being what it is, there always will be while this world lasts, schismatic elements in Christendom. But in ancient times the general unity of the church was the paramount visible fact, and the schisms were generally recognized as irregular and extraneous to the main body of Christians. To-day it is schism that is paramount. The difference is significant, and for us most deplorable.

(e) The description given of the pronouncement of our bishops in 1886, and of the significance of the so-called Quadrilateral included therein, is in accord with a wide-spread view of it, one first propagated by the late Dr. William R. Huntington; but it agrees neither with the body of the Declaration (now generally left unread) nor with the known opinions of the majority of the bishops who were responsible for it. The four articles of the Quadrilateral were not given as a list of the conditions of unity at all, but as "inherent parts" of "the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His apostles to the church unto the end of the world," etc. The text being witness, they are not offered as a *comprehensive* list of these parts, nor as a sufficient basis of unity, but as starting point of "brotherly conference * * * * with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing" (that of visible unity) "might happily be brought to pass." The only *comprehensive* description of these conditions given is, "the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence." I urge the recipients of my statement to read the *whole* Declaration. They will see that our position has been seriously

misinterpreted, and that the Quadrilateral is didactic and introductory to discussion of conditions of union—not a list of such conditions, or an offer of terms. In making this correction, I stand on the sure ground both of personal contact with many of the bishops at the Convention of 1886 and of the actual text of their Declaration, now rarely read. It is given in *General Convention Journal* of 1886, p. 80, and in *New York Church Club Lectures* of 1895, pp. 30-31. I ought to add, perhaps, that I cannot accept pp. 83-90 as a satisfactory description of the situation in the Episcopal Church.

II. *The Catholic Point of View.* I say "Catholic" point of view rather than "Anglo-Catholic" because I am seeking to define particulars which are not at all distinctively Anglican but which, in spite of variations of phrase and real divergence in certain other questions, are maintained by Roman, Orthodox Eastern and Anglican alike. I emphasize this to show that the point of view referred to is not that of a school in the Episcopal Church merely nor merely denominational. It antedates the rise of all existing denominations, and to-day determines *more fundamentally than anything else* the method of approach to the problem of restoring visible unity for over two-thirds of Christendom. My method of expounding it is personal, of course, and determined to a degree by the momentary aim in view.

It is retained, and with deep conviction, by a considerable part of the Anglican communion; and those Anglicans who hold it are convinced that it underlies, and gains significant degrees of authoritative expression in, the official working system and prescriptions embodied in the Prayer Book. In other words, it is held to be the official position of this church. Contrary views are widely tolerated, it is true, but toleration rather than sanction describes the church's constitutional attitude towards them. We do not look to the opinions of "lead-

ers'' and schools, nor even to passing actions of our General Convention (often impulsive and of but momentary bearing) for the real and abiding corporate mind of this church, but to its official documents and permanent prescriptions. These, we hold, make the Anglican position formally Catholic; although happily this does not represent either lack of sympathy with Protestants or denial of the value of certain important contentions of theirs. The outside world too often interprets our position by the utterances of ''liberals,'' for such utterances constitute the kind of ''news'' which gains public attention. But these utterances do not at all represent the central and conservative mind and spirit of thoughtful Episcopalians in general. This mind is often implicit rather than consciously articulate, and is less vocal; but it is more stable, and is more likely to determine in final issue what corporate action for unity can be taken by this church.

According to this Catholic mind, the church was built by Christ Himself through His Holy Spirit upon the apostles and prophets, with Himself as its corner-stone; and it is a sacramental entity, the nature, ministerial structure and fundamental functioning of which are permanently determined by its divine Creator. The church of the baptized—that is, the visible church—is the Body of Christ. And we refuse to treat this description as a mere metaphor, because metaphors do not become the basis of inferential teaching as St. Paul uses this description in I. Corinthians xii and Ephesians iv. For us it is the ''form of sound words'' by which the relations to Christ through baptismal entrance into the church are authoritatively indicated. It signifies that these relations are organic, vital, structural and fundamentally static. The church, in short, is an organism in which Christ is the chief and controlling member or Head, its

ministers are the sacramental organs, and the Holy Spirit is the efficient Operator.

The ministry of the church is the structural element of the organism. Cf. our physical organs (in distinction from the cells), which determine the functional structure of our bodily frames. The three-fold hierarchy into which the ministry is historically differentiated pertains therefore to the church's organic structure. It can be abused and made to function unwholesomely, and then reformation is needed. But since it is organic, only the Creator of the organism can change its sacramental form. It can be adapted in external ministration to every condition of men, and to every historic situation; but it remains (amid all adaptations and even when abused) the divinely created organ for the sacramental functioning of the Body of Christ on earth—His catholic church.

In the language of our bishops in 1886, it is "incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men." Byzantinism in the East, papalism in the West, and mutual schism and insularity between Easterns, Romans and Anglicans, seriously hamper it; but in sacramental form and episcopal method of perpetuation it has been carefully preserved unaltered in all these communions for many centuries—a generic likeness of functional structure such as pertains to parts of one catholic church. In brief, in harmony with our traditions (imbedded in significant ways in our Prayer Book and Canon Law) and in accord with the major part of Christendom past and present, we believe the church of Christ and its episcopal ministry and priesthood to be organic and sacramental, divinely created and unalterable by any earthly authority however wide, and integral to the Christian covenant of truth and grace. To us, therefore, the problem of unity, in large part, is that of bringing all Christians into harmonious conformity

to this sacramental order—a thing only possible when all transcend denominationalism of *every* type, and once more embrace the fulness of the church's ancient faith and sacramental life. We do not seek to build up a bloated Protestant Episcopal denomination, but to do our part towards uniting all in visible unity through a return to the mind and practice of the great universal church of Christ.

III. *Certain Terms.* I am asked to describe my "reaction to the definition of terms" in the volume under consideration. I take this to refer more especially to the words "unity" and "union," "federal," "corporate" and "organic."

They are defined from a Protestant standpoint; and while the distinctions sought to be made are helpful to clearness of discussion, the Catholic standpoint does not permit unqualified acceptance of all the definitions referred to.

In defining "unity" and "union" we have to take note of the point of reference—what unity and what union is had in mind—for both terms are relative. In this volume the "unity" in mind is that of an *invisible* universal church, and the "union" meant is that of denominational churches of all types, whether Catholic or Protestant. This union is held to be the method of making visible the unity of those who are one with Christ in spirit.

To Catholics the "unity" thought of is that of the *visible* and universal church of the baptized, a concrete, sacramental and organic unity that remains so long as the church established by Christ remains, although schisms, and the conflicting factors thereby engendered, obscure it and reduce its spiritual fruitfulness. The "union" of which Catholics think is not between denominations of diverse confessional and ministerial types, but the loyal and mutually loving acceptance by all

Christians of a common polity—one which, however elastic in adaptation to diverse conditions, is based upon, and conformed to, the faith, ministry and sacramental way of life which Catholics believe to have been committed for permanent stewardship to the church by Christ and His apostles. It is a "corporate" union of all Christians, such as will either abolish denominations or reduce them to the unofficial status of guilds or religious orders, such, for example, as was occupied by the Methodist society before it created a new ministry and forsook allegiance to the Catholic hierarchy. The parties to this union are baptized Christians, and the form of it is restoration of a common obedience to one faith, ministry and sacramental discipline. Denominations *as such* have no proper part in it except to promote its consummation and then to give way to the great church of Christ. This explanation presupposes the conviction that Christ's appointments leave no place for "churches," except in the Pauline sense of local or racial extensions of one corporate Body, of one universal ministry and fellowship. It also presupposes that Christ's arrangements must determine the forms of "union" that can abide, and that they should control us at each stage of the promotion of visible unity.

The definition given of "federal union" is very clear. Inasmuch as it postulates continuance of denominational integrity, it does not constitute the union to which we believe the Holy Spirit is now calling us. Furthermore, while federation is susceptible (in the manner which the volume suggests) of becoming an instrument for gradually bringing about full corporate union between denominations of kindred principles and polities, it could never fully unite Catholic and Protestant communions except at the cost of fundamental abandonment of the Catholic standpoint.

Much of the present difficulty of mutual understand-

ing between Catholics and Protestants concerning the goal aimed at in the unification of Christendom is due to divergent usage of the phrase "organic union." To a Catholic who thinks his position through, the only church union which he can strictly designate as organic is an accomplished fact—the union between the baptized in the visible Body of Christ. To bring any one into organic union with Christ's church can mean to us only to baptize him. The Body of Christ is an organism, and is one forever in spite of all the discordances that develop in it. It is also organically one (as already explained) in sacramental hierarchical structure, meeting in Christ its Head. To us these are not mere ideals or figures. They are concrete facts, and as such determine the connotation for us of "organic."

It is "corporate communion" that we seek, believing that such union is necessary for the harmonious functioning and fruitful well-being of the Body of Christ and of its members. If Dr. Brown were to use the word "corporate" instead of "organic" on p. 11, d., I could accept what he there says, with the proviso that I would stress the oneness and plenary authority of the corporation resulting, rather than the human-compact aspects in the movement. Of course a corporate union of Christendom in the sense I have indicated would be a human constitution and have compacts leading up to it. My point is that the Catholic idea of such an union requires that by means of it the church's sacramental organism shall dethrone forever all rival or substitutionary entities and jurisdictions. These shall die, in order that whatever of truth and grace they have ministered and one-sidedly stressed in isolation may live and grow in the larger and more wholesome life of Christ's universal church.

Perhap a few words ought to be said on the controversy-provoking term "validity." To the Catholic mind

a "valid" ministry or sacrament means one that fully conforms to what are believed to be the covenant appointments of Christ. "Validity" means such conformity, and "regularity" means that the sacrament also conforms to the requirements of Canon Law. "Irregularity" means nonconformity to Canon Law and "invalidity" means failure to fulfil all the covenant requirements prescribed by Christ and His apostles. The distinction between "valid" and "invalid" is simply that between fulfilment and non-fulfilment of covenant appointments. This church has carefully—I believe rightly—refrained from official pronouncements as to the validity or invalidity of other orders and sacramental ministrations than its own, contenting itself with taking care to prescribe what it deems necessary for validity. But if it had pronounced any ministry or sacramental ministrations to be invalid, this could not be shown to mean assertion of anything more than failure to fulfil all the relevant covenant requirements.

Such failure, if real, is of course a serious matter, from whatever truly Christian standpoint it may be considered; but the widespread assumption that to call a sacrament "invalid" is to call it altogether inefficacious, *null and void,* is an unjustifiable enlargement of the meaning of the word "invalid," and is to read into it an inference which is contrary to observed facts. I suppose all serious Christians would agree that one who consciously and wilfully deviates from Christ's appointments in the ministration or reception of His sacraments has no right to expect their divinely intended benefits; also that defective faith in these benefits will at least reduce them. But no respectable school of Catholic theologians would fail to answer "no," if asked whether unintentional failures to fulfil the conditions of "validity"—i. e. Christ's covenant requirements—necessarily nullify the flow of divine grace. There is no inconsistency what-

ever between regarding particular Protestant ministries as invalid (in the proper technical meaning of that term) and the conviction widely held among Catholics, Roman as well as Anglican, that God in fact uses such ministries and blesses those who in accepting them believe themselves to be conforming to Christ's will.

The Holy Spirit is not limited to appointed arrangement in blessing sincere followers of Christ who unintentionally disregard them. But we are limited by these arrangements, so far as we perceive or think we perceive their nature; and to refuse, as Catholics do, to recognize the "validity" of ministries and sacraments which in their judgment fail to fulfil these requirements is simply to be faithful to their convictions concerning Christ's appointments. It should carry no invidious implications. It does not mean that Protestants are thought to be insincere, or that God is not blessing them through the minisrations which they believe to be valid, or that mercies vouchsafed to Protestants are "uncovenanted." They cannot be entirely that for any human being who accepts Christ's redemption or, in particular, who is baptized unto the remission of sins.

The point involved is simply this, that the full covenant arrangements of Christ ought to be recognized and gladly accepted by all. To this end it is imperative to Catholic minds that no compromise between the ancient faith and order of Christ's church and later systems shall be made.

It is hard for a "sacerdotalist" to make himself understood and believed by Protestants when he affirms his sincere love for Protestants, his desire for reunion with them and his belief that even now God is blessing their earnest devotion to our common Lord. These affirmations are true, none the less. The sensitive non-committal attitude which sacerdotalists exhibit towards current unification schemes arises not from any insincerity

of his professions of desire for visible unity, but from his conviction that these schemes, as between Catholic and Protestant communions, will not in fact promote unity. Because of the greater complexity of his inheritance, he often fails to make his position intelligible to Protestants. And this failure often tempts him to retire into his shell—a perfectly natural outcome, although not justifiable. Whether I am failing, and shall incur the same temptation, remains to be seen.

Francis J. Hall.

General Theological Seminary,
New York.

THE DAY BREAKS!

Man-made laws and doctrines pass;
Statesmanship is withered grass;
They who spake as sovereign gods
Now are mute as lifeless clods;
Some sure voice the world must seek—
Let the Gentle Teacher speak.

Thrones are fallen; wisdom rules;
Foolish kings are kingly fools;
Royal pomp, which craved the sun,
Prostrate is as Babylon;
Love has come to power again;
Lo, the Christ stands—Let Him reign!

Dead is every king and czar—
Dead as all the millions are
Whom they slew in fiendish pride,
Slew to swell war's bloody tide;
Righteous God, the past forgive!
Kings are dead: O King Christ, live!

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

CHRISTIAN REUNION FROM THE QUAKER POINT OF VIEW

A HOPEFUL feature of the religious life of the present day is the widespread and deeply-felt desire for the healing of divisions among Christian people. Their separation in different organizations, where they have no obvious common life, can speak with no common voice, and are sometimes in acute disagreement with one another, is felt to destroy the very meaning of a church, which should be the fellowship of all genuine disciples of Christ. On the foreign mission field, in particular, the absurdity has long been felt of proclaiming various brands of Christianity, and reproducing among the peoples of India and China and Japan divisions which to them are for the most part without meaning. The movement towards reunion has received a powerful impetus from the war, because of the failure of a divided Christendom to hold up before the nations their duties one to another, and guide the peoples in the way of peace.

The many proposals for reunion, whether smaller or larger, start for the most part with a double aim—that of finding a common creed and agreeing on a common organization. Such apparently, is held to be the essence of reunion. A "visible" church is thought to consist of persons who define their religious beliefs by the same formulae, and express their Christian life through the same institutions. Since nearly all divisions have come about through failure to agree about one or both of these two things, Belief and Organization, it is perhaps natural that efforts for reunion should put them in the foreground. One of the most ambitious of these movements, that which is preparing for a "World Conference on Faith and Order," and which held a preliminary conference at Geneva in August, 1920, shows by its very

title that its promoters consider agreement on "faith" and "order" to be the first object at which to aim.

The main purpose of this article is to question that assumption, and to inquire whether there is not a deeper and much more essential condition of reunion, which is being to a large extent overlooked. But, in order to deal with this, it seems needful in the first place to ask: What is a church?—and this raises the still more fundamental question: What is Christianity? For it is obvious that, if efforts after reunion are to be wisely conducted, there should be a clear understanding of what it is we are trying to unite, and what is the nature of the material with which we have to deal. The second and more fundamental question will be dealt with first.

It is in the light of history that answers to these questions must be looked for. The real nature of the church, and of the Christianity that produced it, will be best gathered if we look back to the first century, when both were at their purest and brightest. Let us glance at the presentation of Christianity in one of the latest writings of that century. From near its close has come down to us the first Johannine Epistle, in which the writer endeavors to fortify his fellow-disciples against moral and intellectual dangers that were already threatening their Christian life. With intense earnestness, and some reiteration, he offers them tests of true Christianity. His first and primary test has nothing to do with either belief or organization, but is purely ethical. It is "walking in the light" (i, 5-7), "keeping the commandments" of Jesus (ii, 3-6)—specially and inclusively the commandment of love to men (ii, 7-11). "We know that we have passed out of death into life because we love the brethren" (iii, 14); "love is of God, and every one that loveth is begotten of God and knoweth God" (iv, 7); "if we love one another, God abideth in us" (iv, 12).

This is a test of Christianity which the church has

rarely thought of applying, though the world does it effectively enough. For the writer, Christianity meant in the first instance *an inward experience* of the God who was love, and who had manifested His character in the human life and sacrificial death of Jesus (iv, 9, 10). It was, secondly, *a way of life* based on that experience of God in Jesus. "We love, because He first loved us" (iv, 19). Jesus had died for men, but He had conquered death, and was reliving His own life of love in the souls of His faithful followers. "Hereby know we that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which he gave us" (iii, 24).

The primary test, then, of real Christianity is ethical —it is the experience, the presence, and the practice of love. But, since this experience in its fulness has come to men through Jesus, there is, bound up with it, another test of a more intellectual character—that of *true thoughts* concerning Jesus Christ. "Who is the liar, but he that denieth that Jesus *is the Christ?*" (ii, 22; *cf.* iv, 15; v, 1.) "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ *is come in the flesh* is of God" (iv, 2). The new experience of God, which had flooded the souls of these first Christians with light and love, had come to them through His manifestation in human form; and this, of necessity, raised the question: Who and what was Jesus? As against the Jewish Ebionites, who were content to regard Him as prophet and law-giver, the writer insists that He must be recognized as more than that—as the Christ, the Son of God. As against the Greek Docetists, who inclined to regard His humanity as a mere appearance, he presses with equal force for recognition that He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.[1] The actual humanity of Jesus is to the writer just as vital as His true divinity. Unless Jesus was in some real sense

[1]This is clear, not only from ch. iv, 2 (quoted above), but from the opening words of the Epistle, and it may be the point of the allusion to His coming "by water and blood" in ch. v, 6, especially if this has reference to the "blood and water" of John xix, 34, 35.

divine, His sacrificial love would not necessarily be a revelation of the character of God; but unless He really became man, with all the limitation this involves, the divine self-sacrifice would be incomplete. Such would seem to have been the writer's thoughts. And so far, but no further, his second test is theological. He never separates it from the first, as though true "doctrine" could be held apart from real experience and sound practice. In ch. iv, 15, 16, the two tests are brought together, and the confession that "Jesus is the Son of God" is almost identified with "abiding in love."

Further, these true thoughts about Jesus are never imposed as dogma, to be accepted simply on authority. The only authority appealed to is that of God, who is "light," and whose light shines in the souls of those who walk in it, in so far as their eyes are "being cleansed" by the "blood of Christ" from the mud of sin (i, 7). The truth is self-evidencing for those who obey it. A Christian is one in whom Jesus by His Spirit is reliving His divine life of love, and who consequently gives to Jesus His rightful place as the communicator of this life to men. The theological test is secondary and subordinate to the ethical.

As to tests of an external character, such as membership in a visible church, nothing of the kind is even mentioned. There is no allusion to Baptism, or to a rightly ordered ministry. By the end of the century such thoughts were in the ascendant, and the writings of Ignatius show the place which, within a few years, they gained in certain sections of the church. It can hardly be by accident that they are here ignored, nor can we be satisfied with the suggestion that they are taken for granted. Had the writer regarded these things as Ignatius did, he could not have passed them over. Though he never alludes to the "church," the term "brother" shows what was in his thoughts. The body of true dis-

ciples is a "brotherhood," a family, a fellowship, bound into one by worship of a common Lord, by a common experience and a common life—the life of love to Him, to one another, and to the men for whom His life was given. The unity for which (as he reports) Jesus prayed is not the unity of those who are encircled by an outward fence of creeds and sacraments. It is a unity like that of Jesus with His Father (John xvii, 21-22)—a unity of mind and will and purpose—the unity that comes of having His quality, His character, His devotion, reproduced in themselves. "The glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them, that they may be one."[2]

The upshot, then, of this enquiry into first-century Christianity, as it is presented in the Johannine writings, is that the Christian church was the fellowship of those who were united to their Lord by the reception of His Spirit into their souls, and by allowing Him to reproduce in them His own life of love and dedicated service of men. The writer does not assume that their unity will be preserved by organization. What he does take for granted is that Christ will manifest Himself unmistakably in lives that are surrendered to Him, that loyalty to Him and the reliving of His life of love will distinguish Christians from "the world" and keep them in unity of life and character. And this is in harmony with the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptics, where there is no sign that He gave any thought whatever to the organization of His followers into a "visible" church.

It may, I think, be urged with much force that the misfortunes and divisions of the Christian church are due to the loss of the Spirit, and to the endeavor to preserve its purity by verbal definitions and the perfecting of its outer framework. It is precisely this endeavor that has failed. The citadel of truth cannot be guarded by a wire

[2]The "glory" was the victory gained by obedience even unto death, but it could only be achieved as it was imparted to others. "I am glorified *in them.*"

entanglement of creeds and ceremonies and ordered ministry. The effort so to preserve it, when the spirit and the life are lacking, intensifies the evils it sets out to cure. All the worst divisions in the church turn precisely on these external matters of verbal definition and rigid order. When the Christian spirit is in abeyance, rigidity of organization turns into tyranny, the dead hand of tradition paralyses life, and any fresh upspringings of the Spirit can only seek for freedom through revolt and separation.

Clear thinking, indeed, has always been needed and always will be; and life will always express itself through some form of organization. Let the church leaders who have the needed intellectual equipment by all means devote their best powers to thinking out what Christianity is and means, to discovering and formulating what is implied in the religious experience that informs the church. Let them coöperate heartily in devising and remoulding, as changed conditions demand it, such organization as will give the largest freedom and the strongest cohesion to the spiritual life of their fellow-members. But let them beware of the divisive spirit that creeps in if they seek to be "lords over God's heritage," and to keep it in their own way by excluding all who differ from them. It is the spirit of exclusion and excommunication that has always proved so deadly. Why should the better thought embodied in the creeds (on the assumption that it *was* the better) unchurch the worse, whether Arian or Nestorian or Monophysite? Why not rather seek, in humility and love, to "expound the way of God more carefully," as Priscilla and Aquila did to Apollos (Acts xviii, 24-28)? Why need one order of ministry deny reality to others constituted in a different way? Why need persons irregularly baptized, or not baptized at all with water, yet in whom the Spirit of Christ is manifestly at work, be ruled out of His church?

In reply, it may be argued that clear thinking and wise action demand precise definition; that we are bound to present to our minds as exactly as possible the concepts we are using, and therefore to exclude that which does not come within the definitions we have framed. It may be objected that I am pleading for blurred and hazy thought, in which no word stands for anything that can be clearly marked. That is not so. What I am pleading for is reality, and the nearer we come to reality the more we find that precise definitions fail us. The exactly defined terms with which men argue represent abstractions and not realities. The world of real things, of living things especially, is one in which classes fade into one another by infinite gradations. Most of all is this the case when we are dealing not so much with objects as with persons, and with the great moral and spiritual values which give to persons their significance. The more clearly and exhaustively, for example, we study the facts that go to form the meaning of the word "Christian," the less we shall be able to define it precisely by any form of words. The attempt to do so, which necessarily involves the attempt to exclude all that is not within the definition, lands us in unreality.

Such considerations appear to be overlooked by most of those who are concerned in the movements for reunion. So long as these are based, even tacitly and unconsciously, on the desire to exclude, they are bound to fail. Representative Anglicans and Nonconformists meet together, and evolve, with legitimate rejoicing, certain statements of belief on which they can all agree. But what about devout Christians, whether in or out of the bodies so represented, who cannot honestly subscribe to these formulae? In a reunion on a creedal basis, are they to be left out in the cold? The Anglican bishops, met at Lambeth in 1920, state that "we acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ *and have*

been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal church." What about the persons baptized under a different formula, as were those of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles, or (like the Quakers) never outwardly baptized at all? The latter appear to be deliberately shut out, though a late bishop of Oxford testified of them that they manifested in no small degree the fruits of the Spirit. Insignificant in numbers they no doubt are; but what matters is the principle at stake. A church enclosed by a ring-fence so formed as to shut out even one true Christian is not really catholic, and may prove a hindrance to real unity.

Many, perhaps, would say that a reunited church, even if imperfect, which all things human are bound to be, would be better than one divided as at present. I venture to suggest that, if it is founded on a basis of exclusion, it may well be worse. The larger it is, the greater is the danger to dissident minorities—in whom, as history shows, the Spirit may be actively at work. Under present conditions, bodies whose members "profess and call themselves Christians," but are regarded by the rest as unorthodox—whether on matters of belief, like the Unitarians, or on matters of practice, like the Quakers—can maintain their spiritual life in fellowship with one another without feeling that they are altogether excluded from the Christian fold. They feel themselves to be Christian Nonconformists of a rather extreme type. But this would not be so if they were shut out from a church which was generally regarded as catholic, and was united on a basis of creeds and forms which they honestly consider to be no part of real and primitive Christianity. A truly catholic church must include all who feel themselves to be fundamentally Christian, even if their understanding of Christianity appears to the majority to be imperfect.

The Quakers have often been regarded, on the mission field and elsewhere, as an obstacle to reunion, because they persist, in opposition to nearly all the rest, in their objection to outward sacraments and a separated ministry. But this opposition, if it is maintained in a spirit that is Christian and not contentious, may prove to be of the greatest value in preventing wrong steps being taken. By standing firmly to their convictions they have already, in a few cases, been able to hinder the erection of fences where there should be none—to obtain a broadening of the basis of reunion through recognition of the reality of Christian life apart from its customary forms. In Madagascar, and to some extent in western China, the "Friends" have been strong enough to secure that their native members shall be received as Christians by other churches (when, for instance, they move into a different locality), though they have never been baptized with water and do not take the outward communion. Unfortunately, this was only possible because in these mission fields the Quakers were a strong minority. At Kikuyu (East Africa), being a negligible quantity, they were unable to prevent a federation of churches being carried out on the usual basis of creeds and sacraments.

The thesis which I wish to maintain is that reunion shall be approached from within and not from without—not by cleverly devising formulae and methods that may secure a superficial uniformity of beliefs and practices, but by recognizing our common life and allowing it to find its natural expression. *Unity must precede union.* When we all mean the same thing—as, to a large extent, is the case with Protestant Christians on the mission field—unity is achieved; and, since division is then felt to be intolerable, some form of real union will without great difficulty be found. If it is the natural expression of true unity, it will be framed in no exclusive spirit, and will not rule out those who ought to be included.

Unity is not a condition that has to be, or can be, artificially created. It arises naturally in the souls of those who open their inward eyes to the truth of God, who follow the same Lord, who share the experience of His light and love. As William Penn wrote: "The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls are everywhere of one religion; and when death has taken off the mask they will know one another, though the divers liveries they wear here make them strangers." "This," wrote another Quaker mystic, Isaac Penington, "is the true ground of love and unity, not that such a man walks and does just as I do, but that I feel the same spirit and life in him." Such unity is already present, in germ at least, underlying our differences of creed and administration; and what we have to do is to open our eyes to it, bring it out into clear consciousness, and act upon it. The bishops at Lambeth show, in their Encyclical Letter, that they are aware of this. They say:

"In this appeal we urge them (Christian people) to try a new approach to reunion; to adopt a new point of view; to look up to the reality as it is in God. The unity which we seek exists. It is in God, who is the perfection of unity, the one Father, the one Lord, the one Spirit, who gives life to the one Body. Again, the one Body exists. It needs not to be made, nor to be remade, but to become organic and visible. Once more, the fellowship of the members of the one Body exists. It is the work of God, not of man. We have only to discover it, and to set free its activities."

If the bishops are right, as surely they are here, the path to reunion is not to try, in the first instance, to find a common basis of creed and ceremony and ministerial orders, but to recognize that the real basis lies much deeper, in the underlying unity, and to lay on this the primary emphasis. We must get to know one another better, in the localities where we live, and find how much we have in common, how much there is to learn from those who differ from us. Such intercourse as is made possible by the Student Christian Movement, and the In-

terdenominational Summer Schools at Swanwick, is of priceless value. We must read one another's books, and see how the honest study of the same facts brings us to similar conclusions. We must study the writings of the saints and mystics, Catholic as well as Protestant, and discover the common experience which they all share and of which they are all exponents. A great poem like *The Hound of Heaven* "reaches the witness" in us all, and it never occurs to us to ask what particular brand of Christianity its author bore. And, still more, we must discover, and coöperate in, our common work for the kingdom of God among men; it is this, more than anything, that has brought together the churches on the mission field.

To seek thus for reunion by mutual education in unity may be a slow path, but it is a sure one, and it will not lead us astray. Already we are discovering that we are much nearer to each other than we knew. We read each other's expositions of the Bible and of religious history, and find that in the disinterested pursuit of truth, whatever difference there may be in detail, in essentials most of us are at one. We discover that it is opinions and practices that divide, while facts and truth unite. In the light of unbiassed study of primitive Christianity, even the chasm that yawns between Orthodox and Unitarian is perhaps finding its bridge.

To wait for corporate reunion till we have found our unity with one another may seem intolerable to those whose minds are set on a "visible" church. But to frame an artificial body for a life that is not there is to reënact the errors of the past; the body is bound to go to pieces. Life produces organization; organization can never produce life.

Edward Grubb.

Letchworth, England.

SOME THOUGHTS FROM MAIN STREET CONCERNING CHURCH UNION

Speaking somewhat in the manner of Chesterton it can well be said that many men, in stepping off their doorstep into the street, by that same act step back a hundred years in social morality. Likewise and with equal truth it has to be confessed that many a preacher and forward looking layman feel that in stepping across the threshold of their particular church they have stepped back almost into the period of which it is written in the Book of Judges that "every man did that which was right in his own eyes." It is not that the preacher has not a message for the times. It is rather the feeling that in speaking of the wider social applications of the Gospel the preacher feels that his own church building is often a contradiction to the very message he is seeking to impart. He talks of social obligations, yet, seldom, if ever, do the churches of his community unite to fulfil one social obligation as a unitary force in that community. He speaks much of internationalism, yet he is hindered in his speaking by the fact of the lack of fellowship among the congregations in the town. Yes, it has to be granted that once a year a faithful remnant from each church does meet for a union service on Thanksgiving Day, and we thank God for that unusual fact. We do not despise the day of small things. We remember that we are beyond the days of the satirical Dean Swift who said that "most people have enough religion to make them hate each other, but not enough religion to make them love each other." We have enough religion to keep us from hating each other and also enough to keep us apart. Our love is a negative sort of virtue. And, emphasizing the duty of love to all men, we are not altogether comfortable as we read that "he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God

whom he hath not seen." It is a strange thing that some people can love the sinner far more than they love the "saints" in the church in the next block.

It may be that such are sometimes more sinned against than sinning. Having accepted the "faith of their fathers" for "better or worse," and not being conscious what is better or worse, they unconsciously reveal the defects of their inheritance. On the other hand, they, who have reverence for the truth as well as for the past, come to realize that the "fathers" built and established their sect by asking, Solomon wise, what manner of house they should build; but unlike Solomon, they terminated their query on themselves instead of on God. That is to say, while many churches were built in the past, ostensibly for the glory of God, in reality they were erected for the satisfaction of men. Standing within the portals of these buildings we give God thanks that these men had such a sense of the Eternal as to provide for their faith a habitation and a name. Yet even as we praise we groan inwardly to think that in their much building they should have manifested so much of prejudice as well as principle. We find ourselves unwittingly drawing a parallel with those of another time of whom it was said that "they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking." Having idiosyncrasies as well as ideals the presence of both is manifest in the heritage which they have passed on to us. We would not judge these men harshly, for we recognize that as their children rise up to estimate their worth it is easier in the tempered light of history than in the heat of controversy to distinguish between principle and prejudice, between ideal and idiosyncrasy. And in those past days we recall that there was thought to be a divineness in being merely different.

The story of architecture is history writ in wood and stone. All our faiths and foibles go into it. Thus it comes to pass that as the years go by it is found that

where men believed they were strong, in reality they were weak. As one passes from town to town noticing how often they are overchurched it needs but a little investigation to find that many of the buildings that have been reared ostensibly for the glory of God were foundationed upon the wrath of man. So to speak is not so much to pass a condemnatory judgment on the past as to arrive at an unpleasant conclusion. Were it advisable, name and geographical location could be given of many such situations. Personal animosities, family feuds, offended pride, unholy rivalry have all played their ignominious part in bringing to pass this state of affairs.

It should also be said that not all of the blame is to be laid at the door of the community in which the church happens to be. There have been days and times when denominational officials were more than willing to capitalize such a state of affairs for their denomination. I know a man who, ten years ago was appointed to go to just such a community. It was understood that he had to build a church. Arriving on the ground he found that a family feud had split the church and divided the community. He stayed upon the ground three years and, to his honor be it said, the church was not built. Possibly it may have been card indexed against him. But some day we shall be wise enough to honor the men who refuse for the sake of a wider Christianity to be the pawns of churchianity. Some men deserve great credit for not building some possible churches. There are virtues of omission as well as sins of that caliber. But to return to our story. For three years the preacher used the movie-hall of the town, and then he moved. But not before he had set the current running strong for consolidation. The manner of it was interesting. The minister formed the habit of going over to the "rival" church on the occasion of their suppers. After a time some of the members of the "split" followed his example. The sup-

pers could hardly be described as love feasts. Yet they did become means of grace, which we believe is synonymous with sacramental. No testimonies were given or called for. Nothing but the fifty cents, the cost of the supper, was given. Then came at last one of the leading members of the "rival" church to the minister and asked him if it would not be worth while to talk reunion. "The people that sat in darkness had seen a great light." The minister looked into the future, and saw what his fate was to be. He must decamp that his people might encamp in the old fold. He had laid the fuse, and (though the metaphor may be mixed, the truth is evident) it was left to the minister who followed to complete the fusion. He therefore moved. Within a few months the congregation moved also. The churches were reunited making one church indivisible. Denominationalism suffered a decrease in statistics; Christianity developed an increase in strength.

The churches that are built on the weakness (to use no stronger term) of men rather than on the glory of God are to be pitied. Yet even of many of them it can be said that an overarching Providence causeth "the wrath of man to praise Him." For as with men, so with churches it should be remembered that they have to be judged by their fruits rather than by their roots. But even remembering that, it surely ought not to be that God should be put to the task of having to bring the wrath of the "saints" to praise Him. The law of activity in the church should ever be that of working *together* for the upbuilding of itself in love. The forces operating in the church of Christ should be gravitational.

Happily for our day and generation there is a strong undercurrent tending this way. The socializing influences of modern life are being felt in every direction and not least within the life of the churches. In business and in commerce, in science and art, men live the cor-

porate life. And that truth is percolating into all the churches. As P. T. Forsyth said in one of his latest and most powerful books: "The same act which sets us in Christ sets us also in the society of Christ." And with many like words does he speak to us. Being dead, he yet speaketh. For these are words that shall be life to the youth of to-day within our churches. It may be that for a time the forces of reaction which are peculiarly aggressive in these days may make much of "granular independency," but the truth that is bound to make itself felt is that of the larger liberty which finds an ampler life in the corporate life of the universal church. We who believe in catholicity cannot afford to be cantankerous.

We of the progressive temperament have need to remember that we move through a sea of dangers to our divine goal. There is need to watch and work and pray. As our fathers were not always able to distinguish between principle and prejudice so there is danger that we may not always be able to distinguish between spirituality and superciliousness. They who count themselves progressive are not always immune from false pride. Furthermore we need to take the measure of our handicaps. What some of these are were mentioned in the opening paragraph of this article. It should also not be overlooked that the problem is sometimes the problem of "the other church." This was brought home to me personally in an illuminating way recently by a youngster of twelve. He sent his chum into the church to know if he could be permitted to enter within the ———— Sunday-school. It is not for me to place the blame, but the fact was plain that somewhere in that lad's religious training he had changed in his mentality the principle of his father's faith into a prejudice against a neighboring Sunday-school. That is to say, he was carrying a prejudice in the name of truth. And that is bad for the

future of the church. Many a Sunday-school might do worse than have an exchange once in a while with a neighboring Sunday-school as is the habit of some ministers in the churches. It might be a little inconvenient for all concerned, and might even lower our efficiency for the time being. But I am rather of the opinion that it might increase our Christianity and heighten our ethics. Such an act of exchange worked through in an appreciative manner would do more for the edification of the two groups than a whole series of teachings on the universality of the church. Through the latter they would possibly recognize the truth of a concept; through the former they would arrive at its reality. It is this interrelationship of communions which gives abiding value to the community church of our day.

The hindrances to church union are patent to all observers. It is not always appreciated, however, that often an all wise Providence goeth before us with the blessings of His goodness. Not alone in the Corinthian church of Paul's day but also often in the church of our day is the foolishness of men the occasion of the wisdom of God. In almost every community it has been found that what was once a divine meeting house can with ease be transmuted into a dwelling house. It was providential, we say, that in the days of much church building that the builders thereof had more conviction than cash. Now and again one sees a church left like a derelict in some country town or village. Of all things to be deplored is such a building, roof partially gone, windows out, doors broken, the whole presenting a scene of dilapidation and desolation awakening thoughts that are far from divine. More than one such church have I seen and the memory is bitter to me.

On the other hand church union is oftentimes hindered by more potent forces than even those of tangible property. Some good brother or sister is not willing to give up the church because their associations with the past

are greater than their aspirations for the future. They are more interested in the faith of their grandfathers than in the welfare of their children. Particularly is this true in the older settled communities of our land. Churches that could well meet in one church building are kept apart because of a sentimental leaning to the past. Sunday by Sunday a little handful of people meet to worship dully in a building that will seat about twenty times their number. Scattered here and there as units through the spacious building, each person comes to feel that in the singing of the hymns he is contributing a solo to the service, and only the "bravest of the brave" carry the tune through to the end. Let those who know speak of the psychological effect upon a minister who Sabbath by Sabbath faces the serried rows of empty pews with here and there an occupant or two. It is a tragic story and accounts for much. Wrote a friend of mine from the East recently: "Why is it that the tone and level of preaching to-day is so much lower than in the days of my youth?" Granting the truth of that charge it would be easy to adduce various causes for it, but outstanding among them would be one that would be terse as well as laconic; namely, too much wood. It is a much to be valued item of news that recently in one of the denominational papers there appeared the information that in Connecticut there had been of late many church federations. That is good news indeed.

Therefore are we the children of hope. The trend of the time is set our way. The fact of union will grow from more to more. It may be that many churches will have to be closed, but we remember there is that that taketh away yet increaseth all the more. We who believe whole-heartedly in church union have proved that statement and found it to be not wanting.

Fred Smith.

Pilgrim Congregational Church,
Carthage, South Dakota.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Rt. Rev. Edwin S. Lines, D.D., preached the opening sermon at the recent General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which he said:

The divisions of the Christian church make one of the greatest hindrances to its progress and the service of the world. They are a reproach to those who bear the Christian name and a dishonor to our Divine Head. That there has been great gain through the cultivation of better feeling between separate bodies of Christian people, a growing appreciation of the waste and loss through division, a growing desire to get closer together, is doubtless true. The impression in the world about us is that there is much talk about these divisions and their evil influence, while not much is done to make an end of them, that churches are not willing, unselfishly, for the sake of unity to break with denominational traditions and subordinate practices and opinions which have been magnified.

The causes for most of these divisions among Christians no longer exist. They came from a time when it was thought necessary to emphasize one or another overlooked or depreciated part of Christian teaching and there is no part of that teaching now which has not opportunity for a hearing and needs not the organization of a new church or the perpetuation of denominationalism to show its value. We are allowing the discord which we have inherited to continue, while we all know that we should make an end of it.

Remarkable testimony comes to us on this point from the great conference of a thousand representatives, one-half native Christians, of various forms of Christian teaching and order in China, held at Shanghai last May. They are driven to feel the absolute need of greater unity among the representatives of the Christian religion in China and their words make a weighty message to Christian people in the Western world. "Denominationalism is based upon differences, the historical significance of which, however real and vital to the missionaries from the West, are not shared by us Chinese and it is a source of confusion, bewilderment and inefficiency." We are receiving from the mission field some of the most noteworthy and convincing evidence of the power of the Christian religion through the presence of the Spirit of God, and now the message comes from every field of the evils of transferring our divided Western Christianity with the message of the Gospel. Differences of worship and methods of work and teaching there will be in the mission field, but different churches are a reproach. It is a true word for the United States as well as for China that denominationalism is a source of confusion, bewilderment and inefficiency.

Christian zeal runs strongly still and will continue to do so in denominational channels. There are great traditions back of the separated churches. No one of them is to absorb the others. Within that greater unity of the future, which shall exclude unworthy rivalries, lack of charity, waste of resources, there will remain differences in worship and in methods of presenting the Gospel. Large measure of Christian unity may come without uniformity, but with the general acceptance in the churches of the divinity of our Blessed Lord, the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, the Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, an ordained ministry, the church, the Body of Christ and a Christian fellowship, there must be a way of leaving behind old controversies and misunderstandings, of removing the reproach of division which rests upon the Christian church.

The church which is not doing its best, whether by corporate action or by the spirit and conduct of its members, to remove this reproach and hindrance to the Christian religion is making its position weaker in the Christian world, no matter what denominational zeal may do to increase its growth and material strength. It is not wise for this church to offer unasked advice as to what other churches should do unless in generosity and charity it is willing to outdo them all. Unsought advice and leadership are not often welcome and it is better to let people find out our good qualities, if they exist, rather than call attention to them. There will be reaction, as there is now, after the vision of greater unity has come to Christian people, as difficulties are discovered and the strength of old traditions is learned, but the old narrowness and exclusiveness upon which sectarianism lived is doomed. The channels which theologians made and churches accepted are insufficient for the use of the Spirit of God. I do not know and I do not think anybody knows the way out to the larger and finer manifestation of the unity of believers, but I believe that it is to come.

How Christian unity stands in Scotland is told as follows in *The Continent*, New York:

We have our 745,000 communicants in the Church of Scotland, and we have well over 500,000 in the United Free Church. American readers therefore will understand that if we can heal the breaches that were made at the secession in 1733, and at the disruption in 1843,—if we can draw together again the two hundred streams of our Scottish Presbyterians so as to make the gladdening river of one great church, national, free, united, we shall really have achieved a momentous and everywhere significant result.

It will be an achievement such as would be represented say, by an American Presbyterian Church of more than twenty-five million communicants—of more than twice that number, if you count children and adherents. And national besides! Something that, surely, to fire the heart of every patriotic Scot, with any imagination in him at all. A free church,

too, established and confirmed by the state in its absolute freedom and spiritual independence—and that for the first time in the history of Christendom.

Look for a moment at all the possible relationships between church and state. There are only four.

First, Erastianism, where the church is subservient to the state. That is forever done with in our land. The Christian conscience can no longer tolerate such a thought.

Second, Hildebrandism, where the church commands the state to do its will. But that is dead as Hildebrand himself; and he has been dead these 800 years.

Third, Voluntaryism—the complete separation of church and state—where the church, as a church, has no relationship at all to the state. France brought this about not many years ago by disestablishment. Voluntaryism desires to bring that about in every land where there is a national church to-day, and is always quoting America and Australia and the other English-speaking lands that have it already.

Well, we do not say that it is not the ideal relation between church and state for you in America. Your case is entirely different from ours, since you never had a national church. Yet, if you invite us to do so we can give reasons for the faith that is in us, for we are strong believers in the principle of the national recognition of religion—just as we can give reasons, if and when required, for our belief in a constitutional limited hereditary monarchy—as over against your American republicanism. We have no quarrel either with your church voluntaryism or with your state republicanism.

But for us in Scotland here, we say, whose national church is the greatest national institution in the land, and has been for centuries—for us in Scotland here it would be supreme foolishness to-day to cut church and state apart with the fierce and impatient hatchet of disestablishment. For we have seen the vision of a more excellent way; namely, this:

Fourth, the spiritual independence of the church guaranteed and confirmed by the state, ratified by act of parliament—the national recognition of religion combined with full spiritual independence; which is the ideal relationship for us in Scotland here.

That is what we got in June of last year, when the king signed the act of parliament confirming us in our full spiritual freedom.

Listen to some of the words of this "act declaratory of the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual:"

"Therefore, be it enacted by the king's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and commons, in this present parliament assembled * * * as follows * * * The declaratory articles are lawful articles, and the constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual is as therein set forth * * *"

[There are nine articles in all—of which we quote only part of No. 4.]

"This church, as part of the universal church wherein the Lord Jesus

Christ has appointed a government in the hands of church office-bearers, receives from him its divine king and head, and from him alone, the right and power, subject to no civil authority, to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the church * * * Recognition by civil authority of the separate and independent government and jurisdiction of this church in matters spiritual * * * does not in any way affect the character of this government and jurisdiction as derived from the divine head of the church alone, or give to the civil authority any right of interference with the proceedings or judgment of the church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction.''

Little wonder that when Principal Henderson, the veteran leader of the United Free Church, gave in his report of the church union committee, he should say that this statement was ''very remarkable,'' and that he knew no statement ''equal to it in fulness and sufficiency,'' which is just because no such full and sufficient statement of spiritual independence was ever embodied in an act of parliament before. And this is what makes us believe that we are working out, for Scotland, the ideal relationship between church and state—and that for the first time in history.

But we are so far only half way through. A second act of parliament is needed dealing with the temporalities—the ''teinds'' and endowments of the Church of Scotland—to make them available for religious uses in Scotland where they can best be used. Viscount Haldane of Cloan, an ex-lord chancellor, is at present busy on this task, at the head of a departmental committee. And when we get this act put through—of course, it must be approved by our church, and must be acceptable to the United Free Church at the same time—when we get this act signed by our king, we shall have the way ''all clear'' for union. The two churches will then get together and discuss the terms of union. And in due time we shall see in Scotland here what the world has never seen before—a church which is at the same time national and free, established and independent.

The outlook for Christian unity in England is told in *The Congregationalist,* Boston, as follows:

Happily, unity of spirit among the different churches is developing rapidly. We have had two signal evidences of it in London during the last month. The whole Borough of Deptford—one of the poorest in London—has been the scene of a remarkable campaign, in which all the churches, excepting the Roman Catholics, united to proclaim that common faith, that in Jesus Christ only is the solvent of all the post-war evils, national hatreds, class prejudices and social sins. All ecclesiastical and theological differences were sunk. Episcopalians opened their pulpits to Free Churchmen, and Free Church pulpits were placed at the disposal of Episcopalians. They worked side by side, preaching at street corners and in market places

the central truth: that the spirit of Jesus alone can give the world, the nation and the individual the peace that all are craving. The Borough was strangely stirred, as much by the novelty of such unity as by the passionate earnestness of the campaigners. The other demonstration of unity was in the Borough of Wandsworth—a great middle class suburban area in South West London. Here the mayor summoned a towns meeting in the Town Hall to enable Christians of all denominations to declare in unison that, as diplomats and politicians and economists have failed to give the world peace after the war, Christianity should be given an opportunity. This, too, was a very remarkable gathering. The fact that it was convened by a layman holding the mayoral office gave significance to it. One of the resolutions called for a world conference of Christian leaders to point the way to a brotherhood of man that shall transcend all nationalism and racialism. If such combined efforts as these two at Deptford and Wandsworth became a general rule rather than an exception of Christian relationships, the reunion question might very soon take on a new aspect. But to struggle for any corporate unity before unity of spirit is generally attained is putting the "cart before the horse."

Can opposites be reconciled? is answered in *The Congregationalist,* Boston, as follows:

It is a common experience that when men of seemingly opposite poles, sit down and calmly, candidly, in brotherly way, talk things over, they are moved to say, "Well, we are not so far apart after all." It is essentially characteristic of the fanatic that he cannot talk things over calmly, but regards either with contempt, or as an object of proselytizing zeal, every one who differs from him.

The independency of Congregationalists and Baptists, seems at the opposite pole from both episcopacy and the connectionalism of Methodists and Presbyterians. Possibly the forms are as far apart as they seem, but there is a place where ideals meet. The writer, on the threshold of ordination, left a highly-connectional communion with the strong hope of finding larger liberty under the Congregational polity. There was something that appealed strongly to him in the idea of a man's being directly responsible to the people who called him as their pastor and leader. Unless he could really lead them, and gain their confidence, the pastoral relation seemed to him intolerable, and ready to be dissolved. The simplicity and freedom of a non-connectional system satisfied his demands. But he was surprised to find that many of his fellow students, equally concerned about truth, and their own freedom, shunned independence as they would have shunned a jail, or a desert island. They feared to submit themselves to the possible petty tyranny of a local church, and liked to feel that in thought, expression and matters of administration they had back of them strong connectional support and organized fellowship.

Similarly, many Anglicans have claimed that in the Church of England there has been more real breadth and liberty than in English Nonconformity. It depends somewhat on the viewpoint, and the satisfaction with which one can make the plunge into the Thirty-Nine Articles. It does seem important to realize, however, that men of opposite external allegiances may have much the same spiritual outlook and quest.

Even between Protestant and Roman Catholic, the gulf is great and fixed, but not entirely impassable. Many souls in the historic communion of Rome are unquestionably more catholic than Roman, and many are mindful and expressive of the ideal of catholicity. There is to-day no more outstanding leader of the older independency than Dr. J. D. Jones, of Bournemouth. We have reason to believe that Dr. Jones has never been impressed with the spiritual-validity of the Lambeth Proposals, and we believe he would shun reordination as the recantation of all that he has held sacred. Yet we have heard Dr. Jones say: "We Congregationalists are high churchmen, the highest of the high." It is a statement that will bear much thought, and one with which we are in entire sympathy. The extreme Protestant, after all, differs from the extreme Romanist only in the fact that he regards the church as spiritual, and Christ as its Pope. It is a large *only,* but it suggests the melting place of two great ideals. There are Protestants to whom the church is everything, but it is the church which is "the Body of Christ," of which He is the Head, and Soul. High-churchism is not all a matter of ritual, and art, and bells, and music and candles.

We have been suggesting the importance of maintaining a communion where liberal and conservative may live and work together. We are disposed to believe in the possibility and need of this because it is our strong conviction that liberals and conservatives are often not really far apart. Each is not infrequently impelled by the passion for truth and righteousness, and by a sense of the value of practical religion and the fundamental message of redemption. The conservative fears the new truth because he is alarmed for the good things in the old; the liberal values the new, because he believes it is bringing the old truth into newer, freer and stronger forms, but both are inherently devoted to the same essential things. Brotherly confidence would clear up many difficulties and remove many barriers.

Concerning the Shanghai Conference *The Christian Century,* Chicago, says:

Denominationalism on the foreign field has been given a most serious setback by the great conference of Chinese Christians at Shanghai. It was the first time that Chinese Christians were ever in control of their own organization. Kindly but unmistakably the influential Chinese preachers told their missionary tutors that western denominationalism meant noth-

ing to the Chinese. More than 130 denominations are now at work in China. These divisions are in the eyes of the Chinese more absurd because many of them could not by the wildest stretch of imagination be of any interest to Chinamen. What would they care about the differences between the northern and southern branches of the Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian churches in the United States? Whether the church should be governed by presbyters or bishops is not to the point. Perhaps the Chinese churches will want a type of government that has no precedent in western ecclesiastical conditions. All of this does not mean that Chinese Christians agree doctrinally any more than American Christians do. But in face of the overwhelming odds of the great non-Christian religions, oriental Christians insist that any other policy than that of Christian union is fatal to the cause of Christ in China. Of course there is the problem of the supporting constituency in America, Great Britain and other parts of the world. Will the western church continue to aid in the evangelization of China if their party shibboleths are not sounded? Perhaps some money now given would be alienated but it were better to delay some operations in China than to undertake to fasten upon the young Christian movement of that awakening nation a burden that it cannot bear. Paul insisted that his Gentile churches should be free from Judaism. He invoked the authority of the Spirit in behalf of this freedom. China needs a new Paul to preach freedom from occidentalism, and to advocate the leadership of the Holy Spirit in developing a Christianity congenial in its outer form and procedure with the mental habits and social customs of the Chinese people.

Unity in variety is well put in the following from Archbishop F. H. du Vernet, of Caledonia, in *The Vancouver Daily World:*

A spreading apple tree, laden with delicious fruit, is a good example of unity in variety. The inner life of the tree is one, the outer manifestations of this life are many. While there is great variety in trunk and branches, twigs and bark, leaves and fruit, there is unity of design, each part being coördinated to the other parts so to as form one harmonious whole.

A federation of the churches might allow for a certain amount of practical coöperation but it would not give sufficient scope to a unifying spirit. It would not provide for the necessary coördination of the different parts. It would not produce enough cohesion to counteract denominational pride and sectional strife. There would be no unity of design and purpose, no harmony of the whole.

While federation alone would not go far enough, organic union, if pressed in the direction of uniformity, would go too far. The laws of life demand variety as well as unity. There are different kinds of tem-

perament, both individual and racial. There are different types of character, both personal and national. There are different tendencies of mind, some active and practical, others contemplative and mystical. Absolute uniformity is a human impossibility.

In view of the fact that the social, industrial and political conditions which must be met vary in different countries and change with passing years, why should the living church be doomed to keep forever to one stereotyped form of government? In view of the fact that some find a liturgical service most helpful, and others prefer more freedom of utterance, why should the living church be bound by any act of uniformity, In view of the fact that concerning spiritual matters there is always a deeper meaning underlying every verbal statement, why should the living church insist upon a fixed interpretation of any accepted creed?

In the comprehensive church of the future there will be unity which springs from the one Spirit of Christ energizing all, as the sap vitilizes the tree. There will be the consciousness in every Christian individual of membership in the one universal church, and this consciousness will be strong enough to preclude denominational pride and prevent sectional strife. There will be the proper correlation between the different branches of the one visible church, and this correlation will result in both practical coöperation and also efficient coördination. There will be the oneness of design and purpose requisite to the carrying out of a great spiritual campaign for righteousness and goodness, and this oneness of design and purpose will control the multiplicity of activities so that the authority of the whole church will be recognized by each branch of it, not as an outward tyranny but as an inward discipline, while at the same time there will be the freedom of choice as to external forms and conventional customs necessary to satisfy all types of mind and meet all conditions of men.

Anything like a mechanical union of the churches would be a violation of the essential principle of life. Before legislative enactment there must be spiritual fellowship.

In *The Australian Christian Commonwealth,* Rev. George Hall says,

The creed of the coming age will, we think, be one in which will be very briefly expressed the faith that is held in common by all Christian communions. A creedless church is almost unthinkable. Even those churches which at present have no formulated statement of doctrinal belief, to which the assent of ministers and church officers is required, have felt, and are now more deeply realizing the need of recognizing some definite body of truth, to which candidates for the teaching office shall be expected to subscribe. That men may at some future time repudiate their former beliefs, and even oppose the teachings of the church which selected and trained them, is a risk which every church has to take; but that we shall select, train, and send men into our pulpits without first satisfying

ourselves as to their acceptance of what we regard as the doctrinal and ethical standard of the New Testament is almost unthinkable. Christians cannot well stand together unless they stand for some great truths which they hold in common. Such truths must be formulated before they can be confessed. We cannot even announce ourselves to be Christians without at the same time declaring our acceptance of Jesus as the Christ. It is doubtful if any man has a right to call himself a Christian at all who does not admit that Jesus Christ is the divine Son of God. It will be seen that when you have declared yourself to be a believer in Jesus, who is the Messiah, the divine Son of God, you have then made a confession of faith which is really a credal statement of Christian doctrine.

Dr. James Denney has sought to meet the situation by what, in his judgment, will be a sufficient statement of faith in a reunited church, *viz.*, "I believe in God, through Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord and Saviour." Some of us think that it will be possible to go a considerable distance beyond Dr. Denney's brief statement, and yet carry with us the reasoned conviction of nearly all Christian people. The learned doctor rightly says, "If we wait for unity in the church until all Christians accept the same Christology, we may as well give up the thought of unity at once." There are those who contend that in order to secure a general agreement we must abandon the lengthy confessions of faith of the 16th or 17th centuries and retreat to the statements of belief formulated by the General Councils of the 4th and 5th centuries, which express Scriptural truth in language largely borrowed from the New Testament. Others would have us go back to the New Testament and express our faith only in the language of those early Christian documents and confine our church government strictly to apostolic plan. This seems to deny to the church of succeeding ages the guiding presence of the Holy Ghost. What is there in the creed, commonly called Nicene, that we would choose to leave out? or what does it leave out that we would wish to include? Its revision, for the purpose of elimination of some passages which deal with questions that cannot in the nature of things be made perfectly clear would be a risky attempt of doubtful gain. On whom shall our creeds, whether ancient or modern, be imposed? Is there to be a very brief creed to which all church members shall give assent, and which they shall recite in public worship? Is there to be a longer creed to which Christian teachers shall subscribe at their ordination? or shall the only doctrinal test be only applied to such as are set apart to the work of the ministry? The Methodist Church of Australasia uses the Apostles' Creed in her service for the recognition of new members. The public recital of this brief statement of belief at fairly frequent intervals has a very definite value for the worshiper. The whole spirit of the age is against the idea that even a brief creed shall receive the unqualified acceptance of church members on pain of excommunication. The attempt to compel all minds to think in unison and to accept one form of worship as alone expressing the divine mind has utterly failed, and must ever fail. Its effect is to produce insincerity, stagnation, or rebellion. The threats of the tortures of the In-

quisition, or of the torments of hell may produce, for a time, a uniformity in expression, but not of conviction. The constitution of the human mind and of the universe is against it. Deep down there is a real invisible unity, and the surface variety gives charm. Such ideas as universal language, or law, or dominion do not naturalize. Even within one empire we have to make provision for variety in race and temperament and civilization.

Religion touches our nature in its deepest parts. In the soul's thirst for God we are one. The cry of the soul is of all ages and nations. There is a universal instinct and search for the divine; but in an intellectual and spiritual outlook and appreciation, how vastly we differ. Our tastes, our preferences, and our capacities are the products of heredity and of environment, and of a thousand potent though invisible influences which are ever acting upon us. But all this diversity—which does not prevent us from combining for mutual and universal assistance—must not prevent us from attempting a united expression of religious belief and worship, so far as that is compatible with true spiritual freedom.

Rome points to the almost innumerable sects as a consequence of allowing the right of private judgment on religious question; but many of those divisions are the outcome of the spirit of intolerance, which suffered no variation from certain so-called infallible standards. Latitudinarianism is an ugly word, but the fear of its application to us must not drive us from the right to exercise our judgment and to follow our conscience in respect to the dogmatic teaching of our theological systems. But though it is the utmost folly for any church to attempt the enforcement of her dogmas by threats and tortures, it is nevertheless well that she should state her belief in the form of a creed. It should, however, be used as a guide and test for her teachers rather than for the purpose of excluding any of her members. The man who dreams of a universal church, in which all shall believe the same doctrines and worship in the same way is doomed to disappointment. The church at Jerusalem would have insisted that all Gentile converts should conform to Jewish practices, but St. Paul would have none of it, and that question was settled for all time.

In modern movements toward reunion, such as the Lambeth Conference of Bishops in 1920, and the Geneva Conference of the same year, and many gatherings since held in Australia and elsewhere, it has been conceded that some brief credal statement of belief will be indispensable, and that for the present the creeds known as the Apostles' and the Nicene might serve the purpose. In reaching that conclusion the Protestant church is influenced by the fact that the way would thus be left open at some future date for a union of the British and American churches with the Greek Orthodox and Roman communions.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Church Unity and Foreign Missions

To the Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:

What is possible to be done in foreign missions may be illustrated by what has been accomplished among the once wild and savage Indians of this country, of fifty and sixty years ago. The Sioux massacre in Minnesota in the year 1862, the Chivington massacre of 1864 in Colorado, the Custer massacre in Montana in 1876 and other like deeds, have told of the once hatred of the white man and the Indian for each other. Was it possible to win such wild Indians to true Christianity? It has been done. Carrying the scalps of Indian children by U. S. soldiers brought fear and hatred to the hearts of Indian mothers. But Christian missionaries, by caring for the sick, by ministering to Indians in their need, and through the preaching of the gospel of Christ, won them with love. The once wild tribes of Sioux Indians, Cheyennes, Kiowas, Comanches and others now have a strong membership in Christian churches, and show themselves as earnest Christians, in many ways. Christian missions have done what armies of soldiers could not do. Once wild Indians have been won to Christianity and to a Christian civilization.

The same principles apply in our relation to non-Christian people in foreign nations. True Christianity can win where other means fail.

Hatred of people and nations for each other, wrong doing, one to another, produce war. The love of God in Christ, through missions, fosters peace and friendship. As a benefit to ourselves and to our nation, this view of foreign missions should not be overlooked.

But our strongest reason for foreign missions is the command of Christ, to go to *all* nations. The field is the world. And our strong reason for seeking church unity is the prayer of Christ, that His disciples may all be one, in order that the world may believe. The love of God in Christ is manifested to an unbelieving world through unity and love, seen in His disciples. What a barrier, then, the present divisions among Christians!

Steps looking toward a World Conferenece on Faith and Order have been taken. Some real progress has been made. The gathering at Geneva has been useful and has been of interest to many. But it may be many years before the ideal of outward, visible church unity can be realized; nevertheless, in the meantime, much can be done.

In foreign missions, the need of church unity is felt more than elsewhere.

The gathering in Shanghai, China, in May, 1922, is one outcome,—the expression of a strong desire for a practical unity, that may be felt by the missionaries themselves, and may also be seen by the many millions of non-Christians in that land. The serious questions arise: What can be done there? What can be done in Christian lands? Is it wise, is it necessary, that each denomination of Christians should set up in China, and in other foreign lands, its own separate place of worship, that each should maintain separate orphanages, separate hospitals, separate educational institutions, separate schools for younger children, and separate colleges and universities? Ways and means ought to be found for combining in some way some of our missionary efforts. Combined efforts will accomplish much more than can be by separate ways. The great essentials of Christian teaching, of prayer and praise and worship, can be taught. May it not

be arranged that missionaries of differing kinds may thus work side by side, in caring for children in the orphanages and the hospitals? The great essentials of the Christian faith should of course be held in common. When possible, and as soon as possible, let some statement be made and adopted of what are considered as essentials of Christian faith.

Without waiting for the results from a World Conference on Faith and Order, steps may yet be taken looking toward a practical church unity, for, in working together, side by side in the care of sick, of orphans and the poor and suffering, there should go out continuously for each other a touch of sympathy among the Christian workers of various names. And that sympathy and practical unity will be seen and felt by others. In some measure, church unity may be realized, THROUGH WORKING TOGETHER.

Each denomination of Christians has some good feature, from which others may learn. The Methodist Episcopal Church has a better organization than many others. Here is an example of a strong government, something that is much needed. The Disciples are making a rightful plea for church unity. Let their plea be heard. The Episcopal Church has a continuity with past ages. It has a liturgical worship, suiting the taste of educated and cultured people. From the Seventh Day Adventists, something to put in practice should be learned. They have a wise and efficient method of systematic giving for the support of their ministers, and of their foreign missionaries.

Back of all these considerations, there is the fundamental question, Why support foreign missions, why send money to foreign lands, when there is work to be done at home? If the purpose be, of each Christian denomination, to extend its own characteristics and to propagate its own peculiarities of faith, then, of course, it is necessary to maintain its own separate foreign missions. If, on the other hand, there is seen the larger vision of Christian duty, that Christ has commanded us to go to all people and nations, if it be, that unity among Christians is one of the great essentials, in order that the world may believe, then the propagation of the peculiarities of each denomination, (however good in themselves,) may be seen as *TRIVIAL*, compared with the larger duty, to propagate the great essentials of the gospel.

Errors of the past need to be corrected. Local congregations have spent money lavishly on themselves, while they have given little for foreign missions. Here is where there has been a great abuse of liberty. Being independent, each congregation has been a law unto itself. Viewed from its standpoint, as an independent church, it is looked upon as perfectly right so to do. But looked at from the standpoint of relationship to the whole world, and of Christ's command, it is a selfishness very reprehensible in a Christian congregation. Enthusiasm and an interest in foreign missions may be made a help to correct this error.

Sonora, California. D. A. SANFORD.

BOOK REVIEWS

"THE evangelization of the world, the Christianizing of international relations, the reign of peace, the purification of the family, and the upbuilding of Christian character by education are the first and most important tasks of the churches to-day." With this sentence as the central thought in the chapter entitled "The Task of the Churches," Dr. Leighton Parks discusses with freedom and fascination approaches to these problems in his recent book, *The Crisis of the Churches,* covering 256 pages (Scribner's).

Using the story of Jonah along with that of Arion he sees in these days of the crisis in the history of civilization that the churches have been like the heroes in these stories. "That is, they have not acted as if they believed that the Lord is present in the affairs of the world but is confined to the sacred soil of the ecclesiastical life. As a result of this heresy the churches have been swallowed by the world." The suspicious, unsympathetic and sometimes even contemptuous attitude of one group of Christians toward another is the modern form of the sin against the Holy Spirit. The churches lack the sense of love. It is not so much our denominational differences that shock the heathen, although they are a hindrance, as it is the lack of love between Christians of different denominations.

The revival of the spirit of missions will help toward a cure of these conditions, but "no obscurantist theology will appeal to educated men in heathendom any more than it appeals to educated men in Christendom. But a gospel which is not confused by myths, but is the declaration of the man in whom we see God, is the need and the hope of the world to-day as it has ever been. When the church recognizes that this is the work it is called upon to do, there will be a revival of the spirit of missions and a revival of the hope and power of the church.

He argues for the unity of the church as well as for self-determination for all churches, saying, "We must find a new form of religious solidarity which will protect the rights of the small and yet make more effective the life of the whole. But the first step cannot be taken till we recognize that there can be no return to the past."

To attain what is necessary, the author says further: "We must not say that 'fellowship' means discipline, nor that 'doctrine' means the Catholic creeds, nor that the 'breaking of bread' means a sacrifice offered by a priest, nor 'prayers' a liturgy. But inasmuch as we neither can nor should desire to return to that primitive age, and therefore cannot restore that early expression of unity, it follows that we should seek for some way of expressing our common fellowship, doctrine, communion, and worship. But as we cannot return to the apostolic days and manner, neither should we insist upon returning to any particular age which may most strongly appeal to us. We have a great history, and none of it should be

lost. The customs which have been helpful should be continued as long as they remain helpful, but they need not be a hindrance to spiritual unity.''

His discussion covers the following subjects: ''The Crisis of Civilization,'' ''The Mission of the Churches,'' ''The Task of the Churches,'' ''Sectarianism—Protestant,'' ''Sectarianism—Catholic,'' ''Organic Unity,'' ''Church Unity,'' ''Spiritual Unity,'' ''The English Tradition,'' ''The Evolution of the Ministry,'' ''The Future Ministry,'' ''Worship,'' ''Doctrine—The Faith of the Church,'' ''Doctrine—The Catholic Creeds,'' ''Sacramentarianism,'' and ''Fellowship.'' The author is not afraid to take his readers right in the midst of the present crisis and point out both the path which has brought us to failure and the path which is the hope of the world. The entire outlook of the book is courageous, healthful and hopeful.

In *Art and Religion,* Von Ogden Vogt, minister of the Wellington Avenue Congregational Church, Chicago, (Yale University Press), has written many things of unusual interest and of timely importance. The different chapters of the book deal with many phases of the life and worship of the church, including architecture, music, liturgy, symbols, and sacraments, as well as the place of religious education and the relation of religion, morals, science, and art. Of special interest is what is said concerning the unity of the church. In the chapter on ''Church Unity'' this great question is approached from a new angle and a word is spoken which is a real contribution to the cause. After speaking of the efforts being made toward intellectual agreement and of the coöperative efforts to promote unity on the social and moral basis, the author has this word to say: ''Vastly more is needed. How shall the voices of the divided churches be heard with effect respecting the rights and wrongs of a world torn by industrial dissension? The crying needs for innumerable reforms constitute perhaps the greatest pressure for a united Christendom. There are yet many possibilities of attaining the desired unions through the joint enterprises in which men of differing creedal standards learn to understand and respect each other as they work together. Yet the appeal of duty does not have the welding fire in it except the situation be critical. There is a third region in which there may be expected important contributions to this need of the times.

''The unities of feeling are more profound than those of thought and more stirring than those of work. Thought often divides, feeling unites. If people can be led to share a common emotional experience they have already been touched by the welding fire. One of the resources for the creation of such experience is that of art. There is something about art which lifts people for a time out beyond the categories of thinking or those of doing. Morality, as C. A. Bennett points out, demands choices, decisions, the taking of sides. These are in themselves divisive. The region of art

is a region of composure, the meeting place of the sentiments of common humanity. 'The artist demolishes the barriers which morality or convention or prejudices set up, showing us that if it is necessary to establish distinctions, it is just as necessary from time to time to rise above them.' ''

Creative Christianity, by George Cross, (Macmillan), is the title of the book in which the 1921 Nathaniel W. Taylor Lectures delivered at Yale Divinity School Convocation have been published. The lectures constitute a ''Study of the Genius of the Christian Faith.'' The task of the book is ''to point out the manner in which the inner life of the Christian people has fulfilled itself by constantly reconstructing the forces operative in it, as the evangel wins new converts and as the context of their lives calls forth spiritual activities of a new kind.'' The chapters deal with what Dr. Cross calls the three most significant directions in which this creative activity has moved. First, Christianity as the progressive discovery of the perfect personality; second, Christianity in action making a better world; and, third, Christianity disclosing the meaning of the cosmos, moulding the universe as an intellectual, aesthetic and volitional unity into the likeness of the spirit that dominates the Christian people. It is a thoughtful and helpful book.

Sermons for Special Days, by Rev. Frederick D. Kershner, (Doran), is a book of eighteen sermons for fifteen occasions of the year, such as New Year, Passion Week, Easter, Thanksgiving, Christmas, Washington's Birthday, Lincoln's Birthday, Commencement Day, Labor Day, and others. They are full of interest and suggestion, and speak a timely word in season.

A notable addition to the Bross Lectures of Lake Forest College is *Bible and Spade,* by Rev. John P. Peters, (Scribner's), delivered in 1921. It is a most interesting book, full of information concerning the discoveries of archaeology and the light they throw on the Scriptures. The six lectures deal with ''The Ancestry of the Hebrews,'' ''Cosmogony and Folk-Lore,'' ''History and Prophecy,'' ''Hebrew Psalmody,'' ''The Exploration of Palestine,'' and ''New Testament Times.''

The Gifford Lectures of 1920 and 1921, by Sir Henry Jones, have been published (Macmillan) in a book entitled *A Faith that Enquires.* The author says: ''I have had one main purpose before me throughout this course of lectures. It is that of awakening and fostering the spirit of research in questions of religious faith.

"If I read our times aright, there are many thousands of thoughtful men in this country whose interest in religion is sincere, but who can neither accept the ordinary teaching of the church, nor subject themselves to its dogmatic ways. I would fain demonstrate to these men, both by example and by precept, that the enquiry which makes the fullest use of the severe intellectual methods, supports those beliefs upon which a religion that is worth having rests. Let man seek God by the way of pure reason, and he will find Him.

"As to the churches, I could wish them no better fate than that henceforth they shall regard the articles of their creeds, not as authoritative dogmas, but as objects of unsparing intellectual enquiry. Enquiry not only establishes the truth of the main elements of the doctrines which the churches inculcate, it transmutes and enriches their meaning."

In a most remarkable little volume entitled *Toward the Understanding of Jesus,* Professor Vladimir G. Simkhovitch, (Macmillan), has uncovered a much needed and very illuminating clue to the meaning of the message and influence of Christ. Professor Simkhovitch is a teacher of history, and his book is an historical study, an attempt to understand Jesus and His teachings historically. He succeeds in "placing" Jesus in the midst of the great, perplexing, stirring movements of thought and influence, political and religious, which characterized the remarkable century in which He lived. Out of these conditions and problems, and to them, Jesus spoke. Not to know these is often not to know what Jesus was talking about. This historical study of "the times" in which Jesus lived and spoke is therefore of first rate value, and it makes a real contribution.

Two Sermons—*The Christian Norm* and *The True Basis of Church Unity*—by Rev. Alfred Rodman Hussey, Lowell, Mass., (printed by the author) are worthy of careful reading.

For high school girls who grope after popularity, *The Training School of Popularity,* by Muriel White Dennis, (Doran), which is a book of actual letters written to a high school girl in reply to her perplexed questions, is a book of letters that would help any girl toward saner standards of conduct and life.

One of the most valuable magazines in the interest of the faith, work and thought of Christendom was *The Constructive Quarterly,* New York. From the start it held a first place among the quarterlies of the world. It is a genuine regret to us that owing to the illness of its able editor, Dr. Silas McBee, it has suspended publication.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CP

OL. XII NO. 3

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

JANUARY, 1923

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.' "—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XII. JANUARY, 1923 No. 3

CONTENTS

COÖPERATION THE ROAD TO UNITY 169
By Rev. A. W. Fortune, Ph.D., Pastor Central Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky.

UNITY—ITS IDEAL AND NECESSITY 180
By Rev. George Woolsey Hodge, D.D., Former Secretary Church Unity Society (Episcopal), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

CONSOLIDATION 199
By Rev. William C. Clark, Pastor Congregational Church, Bakersfield, Vermont.

THE MORAL TEST FOR FUTURE LIFE 217
By Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., Pastor Crowstone Congregational Church, Westcliff-on-Sea, England.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY . 224

BOOK REVIEWS 239

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR OCTOBER, 1922

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN UNION 89
By Rev. F. D. Kershner, LL.D., Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.

THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES 100
By Demetrios Simou Balanos (Translated from *Anaplasis*, Athens, by Ralph W. Brown).

CHURCH UNITY, BEING THE REPORT OF A JOINT CONFERENCE HELD RECENTLY AT LAMBETH PALACE 106

SOME THOUGHTS ON UNITY—A STATEMENT . 115
By Professor Francis J. Hall, D.D., General Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN REUNION FROM THE QUAKER POINT OF VIEW 127
By Edward Grubb, Letchworth, England.

SOME THOUGHTS FROM MAIN STREET CONCERNING CHURCH UNION 138
By Rev. Fred Smith, Pastor Pilgrim Congregational Church, Carthage, S. D.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 145

LETTER TO THE EDITOR 155

BOOK REVIEWS 157

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

MEETING of Commissioners of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Indianapolis, Ind., February 6, 7, 1923.

MEETING of the World Conference Committee on Faith and Order, Kew Garden, N. Y., April 3-5, 1923, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Washington, D. C., 1925. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1923 or 1924. Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople and Rev. Dr. A. J. Brown, chairmen; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

A CHALLENGE TO PRAYER

Speaking the Truth in Love;
Dealing truly in Love.—*Eph.* 4.
Mercy and Truth are met together.— *Ps.* 85.
Love rejoiceth in the Truth.—1 *Cor.* xiii.

Prejudice one of the great barriers to Reconciliation, goes down before the Truth in Love. Think out in cases that you know the difference between the Truth in Love and the Truth in bitterness. Think how Love transforms Truth, warms it.

Take the Psalm verse for meditation, "Mercy and Truth are met together." Think of Christ from this standpoint.

Praying about the great and small controversies of to-day, ask God to give us this approach.

O God our Father, help us as we seek for truth in the great questions of the day to seek it with love towards men.

Help us to seek it not selfishly for the justification of our own actions and views, but for the service of men.

Help us to tell it out, when we find it, not as a War Cry, but as an invitation to service.

Love gives us courage to face the Truth, to "deal truly." Let us ask our Lord for this courage.

Lord Christ, looking fearlessly at the Truth in Thy Love, give us love enough to face the truth in the great struggles of our time, and truth enough to make our Love effective.

Honest searching for truth, with the will to serve which is Love, will bring those who differ on the surface into contact with each other.

Let us pray that in the Way of Truth we may meet and welcome with love those who differ from us.

Holy Spirit of Truth give us a welcoming and reconciled spirit towards all seekers for Truth, whether they are outwardly one with us or not, bring all who are honestly seeking Truth and Service into a fellowship deeper than they have known.

As a daily prayer take the controversies and troubles of to-day in which you feel yourself most involved and let the Light of Truth with Love shine into it. —*The Challenge, London.*

A PRAYER FOR TO-DAY

Challenge Thy people, Jehovah of hosts!
Speak as of old at this hour;
Silence alike their complaints and their boasts;
Challenge Thy people with power.

Speak to them out of the pillar of cloud,
Speak from the pillar of flame,
Show them their sin, lest they dare to be proud,
Show them their weakness and shame.

Give them a task that will drain their heart's blood,
Lead on a wilderness way;
Call them to conquest through fire line and flood:
Challenge Thy people to-day!

—*Jessie Brown Pounds.*

MEASURING YOUR NEIGHBOR'S CREED

THE more readily we admit the possibility of our own cherished convictions being mixed with error, the more vital and helpful whatever is right in them will become; and no error is so conclusively fatal as the idea that God will not allow *us* to err, though He has allowed all other men to do so. . . .

In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him. See that you understand what that righteousness means, and set hand to it stoutly; you will always measure your neighbour's creed kindly in proportion to the substantial fruits of your own.

—JOHN RUSKIN in *Being and Doing.*

UNITY: IS IT POSSIBLE?

No, not if all the churches hold to their distinctive peculiarities without yielding anything for the unity of fellowship; then there is nothing in the world more impossible than a united Christendom. But the whole ground has got to be fallowed and some deep plowing has got to be done. It is going on now. The test of religion is coming to be whether you are willing to deny yourself the whole Christ by your sectarian separation or whether you are willing to appropriate the Christ as manifested in all other Christians, thereby possessing the whole Christ out of your experience and the experiences of others. Your denial makes unity impossible; your appropriation makes unity altogether possible.

COÖPERATION THE ROAD TO UNITY

The feeling is becoming quite general that one of the greatest needs of the church is unity. It is necessity rather than doctrine that promotes this feeling. We are beginning to realize the helplessness of the church in its divided condition. The divided church was not able to prevent the World War; it is not able to keep the nations from drifting into another war. The divided church is not able to overcome paganism; it is not able to Christianize those nations that are nominally Christian. The recognition of the helplessness of the divided church is an important step toward unity.

Much good has resulted from the intelligent discussion of denominationalism and plans for union. This has helped to remove misunderstandings and show that there is nothing but tradition that is keeping some of the communions apart. But union will never come by way of discussion. The road that leads to unity is by way of coöperation. Discussion has had a tendency to magnify the points of difference, while coöperation emphasizes the points of agreement. Discussion of denominational doctrine has led the masses to think in terms of uniformity, but coöperation leads them to think in terms of fellowship without absolute agreement. Uniformity is not essential to unity. The attempt to enforce uniformity produced the reign of denominationalism. Denominations will continue to multiply as long as uniformity is sought. There can never be uniformity among a free people, but there can be unity. Men who differ widely in their views can fellowship each other and work together for the promotion of a common task. Unless Christians learn that lesson the church will be more hopelessly divided in the near future than it is at the present. There are theological differences running

through most of the denominations today, and if uniformity is sought most of these denominations must divide into two parties, the fundamentalists being in one group and the modernists in the other. We must learn that we can differ and be brethren, and when we have learned that lesson there will be no thought of further division and the way will be opened to closer union.

The supreme need in the church today is that all those who pray for union shall begin to live in harmony with their prayers. If all who long for union would practice it to the fullest possible extent the barriers that separate churches would soon be broken down. Much has been accomplished by the churches working independently, but the world will never be Christianized by a divided church. What is needed are leaders and followers who will think in terms of Christianity rather than of their own parties. There are at least three different stages in coöperation, and if we want to help answer the prayer of our Lord for union we must advance along these stages as far and as fast as our consciences will permit.

In the first place, there should be coöperation with the churches of other communions in the exchange of goodwill. That is perhaps more important than we sometimes think. If the churches of different communions ignore each other, or work against each other, it tends to discount religion in the estimation of the world. When churches quarrel, unbelievers and the godless laugh among themselves.

There are two very different attitudes which we may have towards the churches of other communions. One tends to perpetuate division, while the other tends to promote the spirit of union. We may have an attitude of antagonism. We may attend the services of the churches of other communions to criticize and point out the doctrinal errors in our next sermon. If we see a minister or a leader of another church in our congrega-

tion we may go out of our way to condemn some doctrine which we know is dear to him. If we are called upon to preach or pray in a union service we may use the occasion to air our peculiar beliefs or condemn the beliefs of others. We may say unkind things about other ministers and churches. We may argue with the members of other churches to try to get them to change faith. We may rejoice more over the winning of members from other churches than over the salvation of sinners.

That has been the attitude of too many people during the past. There have been communities where a man has not been considered a good evangelist unless he has been an expert at flaying the other communions. In these communities a minister who would preach a dozen sermons without condemning the beliefs of others was not considered sound in the faith. That attitude has divided the church and has deprived it of the power which it might have possessed. Untold harm has been done during the past by this spirit of sectarianism in the church. Thomas Campbell, in the Declaration and Address, described the situation as he saw it: "What awful and distressing effects have these sad divisions produced! What adversions, what reproaches, what backbitings, what evil surmisings, what angry contentions, what enmities, what excommunications, and even persecutions!" Those who are in the middle of life have seen the same situation, and sometimes in our own day the feeling is not as brotherly as it should be.

We may, on the other hand, have the brotherly attitude. We may feel that these other churches are doing the work of God and be sympathetic in our relations with them. We may attend their services as sympathetic worshipers. We may look for that which is good and helpful rather than something that may be criticized. We may be kind in our public utterances concerning

other churches. In sermon and prayer on union occasions we may emphasize the great body of common truth.

We may cultivate the friendship of the ministers and leaders of other churches. We may be kind in our remarks about these preachers and these churches. We may exchange pulpits with the preachers of other communions. We may show to the community that we are brethren in a common cause.

The first step towards Christian union is coöperation in the exchange of good-will. This good-will must be in the heart first and then it will find expression in life. That which is put on for the sake of the public is unnatural and is as sounding brass. When we have good-will in our hearts for each other we will begin to understand each other, and when we understand each other we will love each other, and when we love each other we will find that we are not so very far apart.

In the second place, there should be coöperation in pooling denominational efforts in the doing of common tasks. This is important not only because it gets things done, but because of its influence on the church and the world. When we hold ourselves aloof from others we begin to imagine strange things about them, but when we begin to work with them we find that they are of the same spirit as ourselves. When we have no coöperation with other churches the world is apt to think that we are only concerned about the building up of our own party, but when we begin to work together the world sees that we are concerned about the establishment of the kingdom of God.

Much progress has been made in this type of coöperation. Most churches coöperate more or less in local movements. They combine in union services on special occasions. Union meetings are held in the interest of civic enterprises. It is quite common for all the churches of a community to coöperate in union evangelistic meet-

ings. It is generally felt that a church has the right to coöperate in these common enterprises in which one church is as much concerned as another.

In order that the work of common interest may be more successfully promoted many cities have a local federation of churches. These exist under different names and are rapidly gaining in favor. It would seem that all communities must in the near future have such federations. There must be coöperation in service in every community where there are two or more churches if the work is to be adequately done.

The churches have long coöperated through Bible societies, and through the Federal Council of the Churches, and through other organizations for the promotion of general interest. Most of the denominations have given their sanction to these interdenominational movements, and that is important. This coöperation in pooling denominational efforts in a common cause is a recognition of the Christian standing of other communions than our own and our willingness to work with them in promoting the interests of the kingdom. One who did not recognize the Christian standing of other churches would be unwilling to work with them in union evangelistic meetings, or local councils, or general federations. He would feel that by doing that he would be compromising his own position. He would feel that it was his duty to keep free from all entanglements so that he would be in a position where he could condemn the errors in other churches.

Denominational permission for coöperation is not sufficient. Those who long for unity should take advantage of every opportunity to work with the other churches. When we work together at common tasks we come to understand our need of each other and how much more effective we are when we combine our energies. When we work together we give the world a demonstration of

the fact that we are really seeking to build up the kingdom rather than our own party.

In the third place, there is coöperation where denominational interests are minimized, or even forgotten, by the greatness of the task that is confronted. This is the difficult phase of the problem, and there are two very different attitudes which one may have. He may put his denomination first. He may take the position that his church is right and all others are wrong to a greater or less degree. That being true, his business is to build up his own denomination and get others to come and join with him. Having this attitude he would feel that it is his business to establish a church of his own faith in every community regardless of the number of churches already there, for it is his task to save from the errors of other denominations as well as from the world. He might feel that it were better for scattered members of these denominations to lose their religion entirely than that he should seem to recognize the Christian standing of their churches. He might feel that it would be preferable for the members of his own communion who were not in reach of a church of their own order to live without church affiliation and run the risk of losing their religion entirely than to give their sanction to the others by joining with them. Many good people have had that attitude during the past. There was much objection in some of the communions to giving money to help rebuild the Protestant churches in France that had been destroyed. There were many who apparently felt that it would be better for these people in the devastated area to live without churches than that they should sanction these denominations by giving money to help rebuild them.

One attitude is to isolate ourselves from other communions and virtually assume that they are not parts of the church of God. This is to make our denomination

supreme. There is an increasing number in our day who are anxious to put the kingdom of God first. They feel that it is infinitely bigger than their own little section. Those who have this attitude take other communions into account in planning their programme. They feel that inasmuch as they are parts of the kingdom of God, to advance his interests we must coöperate with them to the extent of minimizing, or even forgetting, denominational connections. This type of coöperation is becoming imperative in certain quarters.

The problem is practical and critical in many rural sections. There are many rural communities where the churches have long been closed. There are members of the different denominations scattered through these communities, but there are not enough of any one particular brand to maintain a church. Because sectarianism has so divided the forces of God that no one branch is able to maintain a church, all are losing their religious interest and the community is becoming godless. Thomas Campbell deplored that condition in his day. Discussing this situation in the Declaration and Address he said: "Large settlements and tracts of country remain to this day entirely destitute of a gospel ministry; many of them in little better than a state of heathenism; the churches being so weakened with divisions, that they cannot send them ministers; or, the people so divided among themselves, that they will not receive them. Several at the same time who live at the door of a preached gospel, dare not in conscience go to hear it, and, of course, enjoy little more advantage in that respect, than if living in the midst of heathens."

The old method of doing church work has been found to be inadequate. It was on the basis of competition and even antagonism. It has left many communities with weak and inactive churches, and it has actually closed the churches of some communities. The feeling is be-

coming very general that this spirit of antagonism must give way to coöperation. An increasing number of people are beginning to feel that where the community is not large enough for the various denominational churches to be maintained there should be some sort of community church. The community church, as defined in the report of the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, is one "which seeks to minister to all the religious interests of a community, gathering to its fellowship and its service all the Christians of the community, of whatever name or characteristics."

Three types of community church are being tried with greater or less degree of success: "the union church with no denominational connection; the federated church which is made up of two or more churches, each of which maintains connection with its own denomination; and the denominational church which functions for the community by including all Christians in its programme." Each of these types has its defects. The union church lacks the inspiration of a great task because it is not affiliated with missionary agencies. The federated church lacks unity and presents difficulties in selecting pastors and receiving new members. The denominational church is more or less exclusive because of denominational connection.

There is an insistent demand today that some method be adopted in small communities which will enable the church to minister to the spiritual needs of all. When a church stands alone in the community it is obligated to serve every Christian interest in the place. The statement is made in the report of the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook that "a church which will not include in its fellowship all worthy Christians is challenged when it claims the right to occupy exclusively a single field. It should include all, else it should give way to a church which will." This report makes a distinction

between fellowship and membership. It says it may be impossible at present to include all in the membership, but all should be made to feel at home in the fellowship.

This problem will have to be solved through experimentation, and, in order that this can be done, denominational leaders must have the community outlook. Many pastors and churches are hindered from ministering to the community by the narrowness of denominational leaders. These leaders are sometimes more concerned about the denomination than the kingdom. They would rather see the community become godless than abandon any denominational contention. The time is not far distant when one test of a communion will be its willingness to permit a local congregation to work out its programme without being placed under suspicion.

There is another rapidly expanding territory where the need is so great that denominational interest must drop into the background, and that is the foreign field. Denominational controversy has no place in a pagan world; it is Christianity against heathenism. Pagans, or even native Christians, must find it difficult to appreciate our denominational controversies. They should not be confused by these things which have been a hindrance to us. What they need is Christianity which alone is able to lift them into the light.

The task of converting the heathen world is so vast that it staggers the church. After all these years but slight impression has been made. No denomination can do the task alone. It can never be done by the denominations working independently, or at cross purposes. The only hope is in a united effort, and there must be such unity in that effort that we will work as one church. That means that there will be no duplication of undertakings, for the need is so great that all energies must be wisely expended. This means that everything that has been accomplished must be conserved. This means

that each worker shall think of Christianizing the non-Christian world rather than building up his own party.

These general statements are harmless, but, when an attempt is made to work them out in practice, denominational difficulties are encountered. If there is to be no duplication of enterprise, then no new station is to be started where one is already in existence. If there is to be no duplication of enterprise, there must be union colleges, hospitals and printing establishments. If there is to be no duplication of enterprise, the task must be divided and each denomination must be responsible for a certain territory.

If a denomination accepts responsibility for a section, it must not only carry on its own programme but it must conserve the work that has been done by others. It must not only win new converts from paganism, but it must conserve those that have already been won. The people in pagan lands move from place to place as they do in Christian lands, and in the natural order of things there are in each mission station native Christians of various denominational connection. A denomination that accepts responsibility for a given territory is obligated to minister to all in its territory. With paganism on the one hand and Christianity on the other denominational differences amount to little. The kingdom of God must be put first, and a church is not doing God's will unless it modifies its programme so that it can hold these young Christians and keep them from drifting back into paganism.

Robert E. Speer, in his chapter in "The Problem of Christian Unity," says: "It is not enough to say one to another: 'Hands off.' We need to say one to another, 'Hands together.' It is not enough for us to agree to differ. That kind of agreement does not fulfil all that the Christian spirit requires. We must agree not only to differ but to coöperate and to bend our energies unit-

edly to a great task too big for all of us, vastly too big for any one of us to try to undertake alone." The great need has forced the churches in the mission field a long way in the direction of unity. Dr. Speer in the book to which reference has been made says: "We are doing our work in the great non-Christian field under the Christian name alone. There are fields like the Philippines where almost all of the Christian churches came together and where they agreed on one single name by which they could call all of their organizations, the Church of Christ." Any communion should be slow to resist such a movement, for it looks like the leading of Him who prayed that His people might be one.

While some are talking about union others are practicing it. There is a movement sweeping over the mission fields and over the needy sections of our own country that cannot be resisted. There will come back from these fields upon the whole church a spirit of union which will repay it for all that has been expended. By cooperating in our own fields we need to cultivate a spirit of willingness which will make us ready for the leading of God.

A. W. Fortune.

Central Christian Church,
Lexington, Kentucky.

UNITY—ITS IDEAL AND NECESSITY

Every impartial reader of the New Testament must acknowledge that the ideal it presents of the relationship which the followers of Christ should sustain to each other is that of absolute unity and concord in one homogeneous body. Christ Himself speaks only of "the church," or "My church." And in the last, most solemn moment of His earthly life, when He was meeting with His disciples as a body for the last time, His prevailing feeling was that of anxiety that their union with each other might be maintained, realizing that it was essential to their accomplishment of the mission He was intrusting to them, He prayed that they might even "be one" as He and the Father were one. That union was organic, so He desired theirs should be. The apostles always speak of the church in the same way. The only divisions among Christians recognized in the New Testament are geographical divisions, "the church which is at Ephesus," or "the church at Corinth." St. Paul teaches that there is but "one body" as there is but "one God," that "there should be no divisions in the body." He sharply reproves those who create divisions; he asks indignantly whether "Paul was crucified" for men, or whether "any were baptized in the name of Paul." The apostles in their epistles are constantly arguing that "love should continue and abound" and that all should be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." All the expressions used in Scripture to describe the church imply the necessity of its unity. "The bride of Christ," "His body," "the holy city," "the New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven," standing "foursquare," in absolute perfection, all are inconsistent with divisions, or antagonisms among those composing it. Take the simile of the body, there must

be complete harmony and correspondence in all its parts for it to discharge its functions or even to exist at all. So if the company of Christians is to be in any sense "the body of Christ" there must be organic unity and perfect harmony between all its members.

Many seem to think that a spiritual unity may exist and be compatible with division and estrangement, difference of interest and even bitterness of feeling, between the various Christian bodies. But surely that is contradictory. If there be such unity it must express itself. It would not be content that there should be such diversity and separation, with consequent frustration of the very purposes for which the church exists. There is nothing so sad, or destructive of happiness and prosperity, as division in a family or hostile factions in a state. The same is true in the church, only it is more inconsistent, for all its members profess to be actuated by love; and it is more detrimental to its work and its success, for men note this inconsistency and write it down a fraud. It is only when men remark, "See how these Christians love one another," that they are convinced that the religion they profess is of God. It was only when all Christians were united, that the church conquered and dominated the world. It cannot do so again until that ideal is once more realized.

So unity is not only an ideal, a very beautiful conception, to which we might aspire but have no real hope of attaining, it is an absolute necessity to the fulfilment of the church's mission. There can be no question that as long as Christians are divided into separate and antagonistic bodies as they are now, they can never expect to make all men Christians nor to influence and control human society as their religion should.

Unity is necessary to give the church the prestige and power needed for the gigantic task of converting the world, winning men to run counter to their natural

tastes and appetites and become the obedient disciples of the Crucified. As long as men see that those professing to be Christian followers are not sufficiently actuated by His spirit even to live and act together in harmony and love with each other, but are divided, cannot commune with one another, and quarrel even about the most trivial and insignificant things, they are not likely to attach much importance to the church, nor feel that it has anything to give, or to teach them. Nothing could so impress the world and make men realize that the Christian religion is divine, as the fact, if it could be so, that all who professed it were of one heart and one mind, welded together, and acting as a compact, homogeneous mass.

So unity is necessary to conserve and utilize to the full all the resources at the command of the church, to prevent waste, overlapping, mismanagement, and loss of power in men and means. As well might an army undertake to carry on a great campaign divided up into sections, each under separate heads, following their individual ideas and plans irrespective of, or in opposition to, those of others. The divisions among Christians actually prevent the church from doing its work. It is notorious that there are multitudes of villages in New England and in the West which are without any religious influences whatever, or only very occasional services, because there are too many churches in them to be supported. The same is true in the cities. There are areas which are wealthy where churches are crowded together, and not half filled, and other districts in which there are none at all because they are too poor to support them. The axiom that "in unity there is strength, in division weakness" is as true of the church as in the world. If all the agents employed and all the money now expended, and the institutions and societies under the control of the various Christian bodies, could be brought to act under one general management or in cordial relation with each other, their

power would be enormously enhanced and the kingdom of God set forward.

Unity is necessary for the church to exert that commanding influence in social and political life that it should. If all Christians were united in one body, working systematically and cordially together, the whole territory of a Christian nation would be covered by those local or general agencies by which every part would be kept under proper supervision and regulation, every individual would be known and looked after, his circumstances, his needs, his very character would be studied and what was required for his welfare would be supplied. All the poverty, misery, vice and crime which now disgrace and imperil every Christian land, would be done away with. They do not exist now, or to only a negligible extent in small communities which are thoroughly Christian. The stronger and richer would care for the weaker and poorer. It is a divided Christianity which is responsible for our most unchristian social conditions.

The same is true of our political life. The almost absolute divorce of religion from politics, the withdrawal from all governmental agencies of the restraining and directing influence of religion, its being almost entirely ignored by those engaged in political life, and the consequent graft, and misuse of public funds and patronage, the fact that government positions are sought not from patriotic motives to serve the country, but for the purpose of obtaining a support, or amassing a fortune, or in some way of advancing personal ends. All the political corruptions of buying and selling and manipulating of votes, the securing appointments, the bribing of legislators, and passage of acts for the benefit of individuals or corporations, can be laid to the door of a divided Christianity. It is because Christians are so divided that they cannot act together and exert an influence sufficient to prevent these things. It is only the general

Christian sentiment of our country which preserves our social and political life from absolute disintegration and decay. If that sentiment could be embodied, and express itself through one great agency, it would completely dominate and control all the affairs of state, as far as moral questions are concerned.

This is true too of education. Unity among the Christians of a nation is necessary to secure for all its youth the moral and religious training which is essential for their full and proper development. It is because we are united in the belief that it is for the advantage of the community that all should receive an intellectual education, that we are able to maintain our universal, free and compulsory common school system. But to train children only intellectually is but partially to educate them. It is to omit the most important, vital element in all education, the cutivating and developing of character. It was assumed at the very beginning of the establishment of our common school system that it would be impossible to have it include any religious education, because of the divisions among Christians, rendering it impossible for them to agree on just what religious training should be given. So we have gone on for generations educating men and women in the rudiments at least of secular learning, which has to a great extent the effect of making them think that they have all the knowledge necessary for the direction of their lives, and that the church and religion are quite superfluous. They are content at the best in simply leading materially comfortable lives, and are enabled often to become more expert grafters and criminals by means of the education which the state has bestowed upon them. The efforts of the various religious bodies to supply this lack of religious education by means of voluntary Sunday schools once a week for an hour or so, and by a few poorly equipped parochial schools or denominational colleges, are absolutely im-

potent to meet the situation. There is no more vital want, no more crying need in our country today than that for the religious education of the young, and nothing but a united Christendom can supply it.

Unity is necessary for the church to do its own work, to bring to bear on every individual its uplifting, beneficent influences, to mould and fashion actions, relationships and institutions in accordance with the teachings of our religion and to extend those influences throughout the world. If a divided Christianity cannot make itself the controlling power even of a nominally Christian state, how can it extend its influence as it should throughout the world? All things are judged by their fruits. There are many heathen nations today who are studying our civilization and trying to decide if it is superior to their own, and if so, how far is that superiority due to our religion. And they must often conclude that our religion is not able to accomplish what it professes. They even find it difficult to determine what the Christian religion really is, so various are the presentations of it which they see. How utterly confusing to the heathen mind must be the totally different, unconnected and even antagonistic aspects of Christian teaching and practice. And can the desultory, unrelated, spasmodic efforts of various voluntary societies, by any possibility accomplish the enormous task of transforming the religion and moral and ethical ideas of millions of people? Men talk of turning the world to Christ in a generation; they must first be united themselves in order to do it. Christ committed to His church the task not only of turning individual souls from evil to righteousness, but of converting the world, influencing, uplifting and sanctifying all human relationships, and love and unity among Christians themselves is absolutely necessary for its accomplishment.

It is in the effort of different Christian bodies to carry

on missionary work among heathen nations, that the practical impossibility of extensive and permanent success is most palpably felt. In all the missionary fields, the workers on the ground realize how their efforts are paralyzed by the divisions and diversities among themselves, and everywhere practical steps toward securing unity are being taken. It is the Christian missionary in foreign lands that is leading the world in this direction. But unity is just as necessary in Christian as in heathen lands, and it cannot be effectively manifested in the latter until it is attained in the former.

Then there is no question but that the widespread scepticism of the day, the undermining of faith in the Bible and the fundamental truths of religion, the secularization of Sunday, the growing neglect of public worship and religious ordinances, and consequent indifference to spiritual interests, are largely due to the differences among Christians. Men argue that if Christians cannot agree among themselves as to what is true, it is evident that there can be no certainty as to what is Christian teaching, and it is consequently not a matter of much importance. It is a terrible indictment to bring, but we believe that Christians themselves are, by their dissensions, mainly responsible for the prevalent irreligion of the day.

The truth is Protestants must come to recognize that schism is a sin, which like all other sins brings in its train dire consequences. And if our fathers wittingly or unwittingly committed it, we are suffering from the results today. Though the Scriptures vehemently denounce it as a sin, and the Catholic Church has always taught that it is such and made its children constantly pray to be delivered from it, Protestants have ignored, or minimized it, or tried to cast the blame of it on others rather than on themselves. But it is one of the greatest of sins. It is the rending of the very body of Christ.

Schism is in the church what treason or secession would be in the state; it destroys its integrity and efficiency. Unless its sinful nature and terrible consequences are appreciated there will be but little hope of its being avoided or its results prevented.

So we maintain that unity is not only a beautiful ideal, but it is a necessity, both to render the church powerful to do its work, to preserve it from contempt, and to give it even the chance of eventual success.

If unity among Christians is the ideal after which all should strive, and necessary for the success of the work given the church to do, can it be realized, and if so, how?

To remedy an evil, it is first necessary to discover its cause. How did this condition of things, which is so inconsistent with the teaching of the Christian religion and so detrimental to the fulfilment of its mission, come about? Are the causes natural and inevitable, or are they morally wrong, and are they remediable?

If we trace every existing division among Christians to its source we shall find that it was due to the indulgence of some evil disposition, or at least to some human failure or weakness. Schism is not only the fruitful cause of evil, it is evil in itself. They who cause it are wrong doers, or if acting conscientiously, as they often have, their minds and consciences needed enlightenment. The vast majority of the divisions which have occurred among Christians have been due either to the personal ambition and pride of individuals seeking pre-eminence and power, wealth and position, to political machinations and policies, to racial hatreds and jealousies, to overweening confidence in individual wisdom and lack of charity and understanding of others, to a mistaken idea of the necessity of conformity to an unbending rule or system, and of absolute agreement in all particulars of belief and practice, to the conviction of the justice and rightfulness of the endeavor to force one's opinion on

others. These have been the fruitful causes of the failure of Christians to agree and work together in harmony as one body. And the pity of it is, that these divisions having come about, through one or another, or a combination, of these causes, they have become stereotyped, and generations have come into the world as members of these bodies and have grown up in them, never knowing or understanding any other type of Christianity, and having no appreciation of the original wrong of the division, nor the harm that it does, and so have felt under no obligation, and made no effort, to remedy it. And thus it is continued on from age to age, and the rent in Christianity becomes wider and wider, and more difficult to heal. These divisions often last on though the original causes no longer exist. Many of the present antagonisms are due to issues long since absolutely dead. They could not possibly be caused to-day. Our ideas and conceptions concerning them have utterly changed. Men were once driven out of the church by persecution. But Christians no longer persecute. It was once thought that there could be no possibility of salvation unless one held strictly to an exact formula, and practised certain prescribed acts. Now we have learned that truth is many-sided, and that no mind can grasp and comprehend it in its entirety, that the love of God is boundless, that the essentials of the Christian faith are few and simple, and while men hold to them and lead holy lives they are acceptable to God and can do His work, even though they are not all of the same mind in everything. So there is almost an universal tolerance among Christians today, and a respect for each other's opinions and preferences, even if there is not unity. But if we have gone so far as to gain the one, why should we not gain the other?

Many of the divisions among Christians are concerning the most trivial, really unimportant matters. Why should Christians be divided about the exact terms ex-

pressing mysterious truths, when no human language can possibly convey to any one mind all that enters into them? Why should there be dispute about the precise method or formula used in bestowing the offices of the Christian ministry, seeing none is prescribed by divine authority? Why should there be dispute about the mode of administering Baptism, or even the Lord's Supper, much less about the accessories of divine worship. There has been more contention about forms, about vestments, candles and incense, about standing or kneeling, about singing of hymns or only psalms, about even the use of organs, than there has been in reference to "the weightier matters of the law." And men are more impressed and influenced by such things, feel more bitterness and enmity toward each other in regard to them, than they do about differences of doctrine or discipline.

Some hold that these are matters of importance on account of the doctrines which they symbolize and teach. But that connection is arbitrary. The doctrine can be taught without them, and the doctrines which it is claimed they teach are not those affecting salvation. The Catholic and Protestant now alike acknowledge that each can be saved, though the theoretical position and practice of the several bodies is so different. They recognize each other as belonging to the spiritual, if not the visible, body of Christ. Why should not that real unity of view be manifested outwardly, and allowance be made for different views and tastes? Is it not manifestly wrong that anything which is not absolutely essential to the doctrine, discipline or worship of the church, should be made, or allowed to continue to be, a cause of division among Christians?

The first essential step toward unity of different Christian bodies, is to study the original cause of the separation and discover if it has not already been practically removed. If so, there is no right nor reason for the con-

tinuance of the division. Or if it has not been removed, the effort should be made to do so, or to determine whether it is sufficient to justify division, or whether it cannot be obviated in some way. If this were honestly and earnestly undertaken a large number of the present religious bodies would find that they could coalesce at once.

If there is to be any hope of bringing about this unity of Christendom there must be first a general recognition of the wrong and the harm done by division. As long as people look upon the present condition of things as right and natural, and say that it is due to diversity of views and tastes which should be given full opportunity for expression or exercise, that people always have and always will differ thus, that it is absurd and useless to expect it to be otherwise, that there are even certain advantages in it as affording freer scope for individual action than there could be in one large, general body, that it promotes a generous rivalry in good works, etc., of course people will not be interested in, nor make any effort to attain unity. Men must be roused to a realization of the fact that disunion is radically and essentially wrong, that it is inconsistent with the spirit and teaching of the Christian religion and a terrible drawback to its efficiency and success. They must learn to lament and grieve over it as that which is a grave defect and blemish in their religion, and must by some means and at all costs be remedied; then, and then only, will the way be found to do so. As men cannot really pray unless there is "a hearty desire to pray," so Christians will never become united in one body, until they one and all come to feel that their separation into different organizations is unchristian and suicidal.

It is one of the most hopeful signs of the times that that feeling is largely manifest and is constantly growing. While there are multitudes who are still perfectly

contented with their denominational isolation, and think that there is no need of, nor even advantage to be gained by, unity, yet there are many who are greatly stirred by the sense of the wrong of division and the evils it produces and are earnestly planning and striving to find a means by which unity may be attained. Though no generally feasible scheme seems yet in sight by which all Christians could be brought together in one body there never has been a time when there has been so much thought given to, and so much discussion of, the subject, so many agencies actually formed and machinery set in motion to bring it about. One can hardly take up a religious paper or hear an address made at any large gathering of church people, without hearing this question referred to or discussed. But there must be a great deal more education of the consciences of Christian people before the desire, and felt need of unity becomes so great as to make them feel compelled to take the steps necessary to bring it about.

Then secondarily, there must be the sense of personal, or at least corporate, responsibility in this matter, and the searching out what we, or the particular body to which we belong, are doing to perpetuate the wrong, or to hinder union with other Christians. We must learn to consider not the sins of others, but our own sins in this particular, not to dwell on the assumptions, or arrogancy, or intolerance, or bigotry, or upon the unbending attitude of other bodies, which is preventing union, but what we individually, as far as our influence extends, are doing to break down the barriers and remove the hindrance to the accomplishment of unity. The Roman Catholic should ask himself whether the claim of the bishop of Rome to universal jurisdiction and personal government of the whole church of Christ has sufficient ground to be maintained as essential even to communion with other Christians who deny it. The Greek should ask himself

whether his conception of his church as the only Catholic church, and of Orthodoxy as necessary to be accepted in all particulars, should be required as terms of communion. The Anglican should ask whether his theory in regard to episcopacy and rigid adherence to certain formularies must be imposed upon all. The Presbyterian should ask whether there could be no possibility of an accommodation of a diocesan episcopacy with his theory of presbyter-bishops, or the general use of a liturgy with liberty for free prayer. The Baptist should consider whether he is justified in insisting upon immersion as the only possible form of valid Baptism. The Methodist should consider whether he could not return to the original conception of the founders of Methodism, as of an organization auxiliary to the church from which it arose, not as independent of and superseding it. The Congregationalist should ask whether the rights and practical independence of the individual congregations could be secured, and yet an effective union be sustained with a general organization. If the members of each existing body of Christians would assume this attitude, seeking to remove any hindrance erected by it to a general union of all, the possibility of union would be materially increased.

Thirdly, the whole question must be approached with an absolutely open mind, free from prejudice and presuppositions. This will be very difficult to attain. All have inherited prejudices. The Catholic is brought up from his earliest years to look upon all Protestants, if not to be put absolutely in the category of atheists and infidels, at least as persons living outside the true church, cut off from all its sacraments and ordinances, not entitled even to Christian burial when dead. And the majority of Protestants look upon Roman Catholics as idolatrous, superstitious and benighted, holding tenets and practising rites which to them seem inconceivably puerile

and impossible for intellectual persons in this age of the world. Anglicans look upon Protestants generally as having wilfully and unnecessarily departed from the order and discipline of the universal church, set at defiance the judgment of the centuries, and thrown to the winds all that seems to them most necessary, attractive and valuable in the teaching and practice of the church. Protestants think of Anglicans as stiff and unbending, insisting upon what is not essential, as formalists, and more intent upon outward requirements than spiritual realities. Now all these judgments are untrue. The members generally of each of these bodies do not hold the opinions and have the feelings which are attributed to them by the others, except in some extreme cases and to a limited extent. And each of them stands for some truth or valuable practice which the others overlook, or do not emphasize as they should.

And the same is true of all the minor bodies with which Christians are divided. Truth is so many-sided that it is impossible for any one mind to comprehend or appreciate it in all its aspects. It is natural for one phase of truth to appeal more to one mind or temperament than to another, hence there is always the tendency for one man, or a group of men, to run one view of truth to the ground as it were, that is, to overemphasize it and attach to it undue importance, to the neglect of other truths. This is the real reason why the various divisions among Christians, when not caused by personal pride or ambition, have come about. One man has come to feel himself justified in leaving that body and forming another which would rightly teach what he considers true. And these things have become fixed in time, so that one body stands for one truth and one for another, and they have seemed contradictory to one another. But in reality they are complementary. Almost any doctrine, or the practice of any Christian denomination might, if it were

properly poised, placed and held in due relation with other doctrines and practices, be found to be related to them, counterbalanced and explained and capable of forming part of a general and harmonious whole. Catholics and Protestants are all Christians, they hold essentially the same faith, and practice most of the same rites, though attaching to them different conceptions and using different forms and methods in their administration. The great majority hold to the same creeds. They believe in the same God, and look for salvation for the world through the same Saviour. Where they differ is on questions of theory and speculation, or as to additional and minor views not covered by those creeds, or not essential, to what is primary in the Christian system.

That which is needed on the part of all is the ability to discriminate between what is essential and what is non-essential. Often things which are trivial and of little importance are elevated to a position, and a significance is attached to them, which is utterly unnecessary and misleading, and causes alienation and separation which would be avoided if their importance were more justly estimated. A large number of the separations among Christians have been due to such insignificant causes which having created division, years, perhaps centuries, ago are still perpetuated by mere inertia. Many bodies and institutions are actually in the grip of a dead hand, whose grasp apparently nothing will relax. Multitudes belong to religious bodies who have not the most remote idea for what those denominations really stand, and how they ever came into being. They simply are connected with them because their fathers were members of them or their friends have asked them to join them, and their whole view of truth is circumscribed by the teaching to which they have been accustomed. They do not think it possible that anything different, or contrary, to these teachings can be true.

It is necessary to rise superior to all these presuppositions, to look at things impartially, *de novo* as it were, to be willing to recognize and adopt whatever may be true and useful from whatever source it may come, or wherever it may be found, not to condemn absolutely any Christian body as one with which we can have no intercourse, nor sympathy, because there are some things connected with it which we do not personally fancy nor approve. We must have minds capable of discriminating between what is true and false, what is good and evil, and free to accept the one and reject the other irrespective of the association in which we find it.

Fourthly, it must be recognized that no existing Christian body can expect simply to absorb the others, demanding that all shall receive its teachings and customs just as they stand to-day. The separations between Christians have lasted too long and become too fixed to be healed in that way. The present members of the various denominations have no sense of having been the cause of, or being in any way responsible for, these divisions. They do not look upon themselves as seceders, or rebels against the original body. They have been born and brought up in these various organizations, they seem to them right, and natural, and they often even glory in them. They are proud of their spiritual ancestry, of fathers whom they believe to have been noble and heroic men who, frequently at the risk of persecution, were bold enough to stand up and suffer for what they held to be truth and right, and to bear their testimony against oppression and wrong. It is not to be expected that these men will return in repentance and sorrow to churches out of which their fathers went in wrath and indignation. These were causes which may have seemed to them to have justified separation then, and if they exist still they must be removed before reconciliation can become possible. No one Christian body today is capable of em-

bracing all forms and phases of contemporary religious thought. But it ought not to be impossible for the present systems so to be modified that such a body could be formed. If all could rise to the conception of a really Catholic Church such as we believe was in the mind of the Founder of the Christian religion which should embrace all people, and be willing to insist only upon what is actually essential to it, then each existing body would break down the bars and barriers it has erected to keep out its fellow Christians, and all gladly come together, each bringing its own individual contribution of truth or practices for which it stood, enriching the common stock thereby.

As in St. John's vision of the New Jerusalem "all the nations and all the kings of the earth" would "bring their glory and honor into it." Such a process would not mean surrender or compromise, but *comprehension.* That word we believe contains the secret which will bring about the eventual reunion of Christendom. When men come to be more intent upon learning and gaining from others all they may have to give, than in insisting upon, and trying to force on others, their own views and preferences, then will they, by a perfectly natural and easy process, come to coalesce in heart and life in an organization founded on the principle of unity in essentials, which no difference of view or taste in lesser, non-essential matters could by any possibility break.

It must be recognized, that all Christians cannot become only Roman Catholics, or Greeks, or Anglicans, or Presbyterians, or Methodists, or members simply of any one of the present Christian denominations, for each one is but a section, of the Christian world, that is a sect, something which is cut off from a whole, and a sect is limited, it is narrow, narrowing and imperfect. The need of the day is the reconstruction of that which existed in the first Christian ages, one united body, extend-

ing into all lands and embracing all people, whose essential structure and teaching is simple and received by all, but which recognizes and in which allowance is made for the greatest variety of belief and practice on all non-essential points and the fullest liberty of thought and expression consistent with adherence to fundamental principles, adapting itself to the characteristics and wants of all called into the unity of the church.

This would not mean the despotism of a single government, or a vast political machine. There need be no central, general government at all. There was none in the early church. Each company of Christians was constituted under its elders, or chief men who exercised the offices of the ministry. The apostles founded churches and ordained elders in every place they visited. The government was by councils. As Ignatius taught, the bishop did nothing without his presbyters, and they did nothing without him. When any general question arose it was referred to a council, more or less general, of the whole church, as the question affected local or general interests. That has been the universal theory of church government, however much it has been modified by the growth of papal power or the formation of larger or smaller bonds of union, or by the connection of the church with the state, or the independence of individual congregations.

The prevailing principle has been that of conciliatory government, reaching up from parochial organizations to general councils representing the whole church. There must, naturally and necessarily, be national divisions among Christians. Each national church should be autonomous, with freedom to rule its individual affairs. But no national church even, much less any section or subdivision thereof, has power to rule in regard to the essential faith or discipline of the church. The whole church can alone determine such questions, so they

should be referred to councils representing all of Christendom. And as all members of a nation should be united in one church, so all national churches should be in communion with each other, without any actual political relationship beyond the willing meeting together of representatives of each, when occasion may require.

It would not necessitate a great deal of modification of existing ecclesiastical governments to agree on these general principles, if the idea of the divine appointment of one or other of the present particular forms, could be given up by its too ardent advocates. Surely this is the ideal of an universal church, in which there should be room for freedom of action for individual parts, yet all held together by a common bond.

This would apply to matters of doctrine and practice as well. None should be expected to give up his conscientious convictions, or whatever forms or modes of worship are valuable or dear to him. But all recognizing the fact that they believe in the same God and trust in the same Saviour, and profess substantially the same faith, should be able to dwell together in the same communion and fellowship, not allowing minor differences to separate them from each other.

Until the spirit which is capable of doing this is attained, there can be no prospect of any extensive church unity.

George Woolsey Hodge.

Former Secretary Church Unity Society,
Philadelphia, Pa.

CONSOLIDATION

What can we say against competition in business when we see so much competition in religion? How can a preacher preach against rivalry in business when there are four rival churches struggling for existence in a little town which needs but one?

Small railroads are consolidating into great railway systems. Small stores are merging into great department stores. Firms are uniting to form syndicates. To oppose this tendency to centralization is as useless as to resist the incoming tide of the great Pacific. They who are in partnership with God must adopt this approved, up-to-date business principle. Christians must get together. And if the churches can take the lead instead of lagging behind, if they can succeed in establishing a coöperative system, perhaps their experiences will enable them to give points to those thoughtful leaders who sincerely desire to reconstruct business on the cooperative plan.

The prayer of Jesus was, "That they all may be one, . . . that the world may believe." We deceive ourselves if we fancy that Jesus referred to a merely spiritual unity. If there is to be a unity which will convince the world that Jesus is divinely sent with a commission from heaven, there must be a unity which the world can see.

A Divided Christendom

At present the world does not recognize such a unity as Jesus prayed for. The world sees a divided Christendom. Protestants are sending missionaries to Roman Catholic countries. In competition with Rome, Protestantism is handicapped by schism. We have in the United States about a hundred and twenty Protestant sects.

Here is a waste of energy and a waste of money. No long array of statistics is necessary to prove it. In response to inquiries from the Interdenominational Comity Commission of the state, seventy-one pastors of Vermont churches admit that their towns are over-churched. And surely Vermont is no worse than other states. Josiah Strong says: "I am informed of a village in Kansas where there are ten churches, four or five of them being Presbyterians of varying tint, and nine of these ten churches are dependent on home missionary societies."* The reader probably knows a town of three thousand inhabitants where there are three, four, or possibly six Protestant churches struggling for existence. Perhaps some of them are supported in part by missionary funds sent into the town by sectarian enthusiasts. Each church supports a costly plant. All ring their bells at the same hour on Sunday. Probably they are bunched together in the center of the village. Each church has a full set of machinery, all constructed on the same model. Whatever one has all must have. Each minister tries to be an all round man.

Why these sectarian divisions? Probably they date back to a time when doctrinal discussion ran high. But as a rule the original reason for the division no longer exists. Fortunately or unfortunately, doctrinal preaching is out of date. Theological hair splitting has been condemned by the people. Polemical essays are on the shelf.

Denominations differ more in polity than in doctrine. Each has a pet way of doing things. Some prefer a local democracy; others prefer a centralized government.

In many communities social differences are keenly felt. Intellectual stratification is palpable. People have different tastes. Some desire intellectual preaching; some are best reached through the emotions. Pomp and ritual

The New Era, p. 303.

attract some, and repel others. However, these differences are lessening with popular education. We are unwilling to admit that intellectual stratification and social caste must be permanent.

While we look at the evident reasons which keep churches apart, we must not ignore the urgent reasons for coming together. Some of these reasons have been suggested already. In union there is economy, and economy is one of God's principles. Not only would there be economy of money, but also economy of spiritual gifts. In union there is strength. The forces of evil are getting together. If we are to conquer the world, we must coöperate under a concerted plan.

In discussions of this subject two arguments for consolidation have commonly been overlooked.

Notice the inspiration of numbers in a religious convocation. In a small town where two hundred people worship by fifties in four churches, what an uplift would come if they would unite in one congregation on Sunday morning! Four choirs formed into one, full pews instead of empty, fervor multiplied by addition. One large fire gives more heat than four small ones. In a larger town if four congregations of five hundred would unite to form a grand assembly of two thousand, how inspiring would be the worship! One of the most vivid reminiscences of the Psalmist was this:

> "These things I remember, and pour out my soul within me,
> How I went with the throng, and led them to the house of God,
> With the voice of joy and praise, a multitude keeping holyday."

Again, see how the church is weakened socially by sectarian divisions. The popular fraternity takes the interest of men away from the church. Why does the fraternity exist? Because men of different religious denominations desire to get together socially. The church is not giving men all the social life which they crave. The local church club cannot do it, in a town with several

churches. Men who are associated in business and in civic affairs are good comrades, but in their church affiliations they are separated; hence their religious life and their social life take different courses. It is unreasonable that children who are chums in the public school should part company on Sunday and go to different Sunday schools. It is unreasonable that men who are partners in business or fellow-workmen in the shop should separate on Sunday because they happen to have different traditional church affiliations. One church in a village can control the social life, but where the best people are divided in their religion the social life unfortunately passes out from the influence of the church. Through these out-of-date sectarian differences the church has lost its social leadership, and the loss is immeasurable.

Some good people cheat their consciences by saying that it is well to have more than one church in a town. because competition stimulates to effort. If you will stop and think what that means, you will never say it again. The current sentence, "Competition is the life of trade," is one of Satan's favorite lies. Competition means not life but war to the death. A slight change in the word "rivalry" will make it read "deviltry." If one church in a town becomes stagnant, dormant, or self-satisfied, it needs something else than competition. It needs the quickening Spirit which Ezekiel invoked upon the dry bones.

The purpose of this article is to show how it is possible to retain variety in unity; how it is possible for people with different ambitions, tastes, and viewpoints to find real fellowship and to coöperate successfully in one church of Jesus Christ.

With his customary thoroughness and directness, Josiah Strong says: "The most serious obstacle to organic union is not differences of creed or polity or ritual,

but a lack of entire confidence. The secret of sectarian competition is the belief (not always unexpressed) that the world stands in peculiar need of *our* church and the type of character produced by it; the conviction that *we* are a little nearer the Lord and a little more pleasing to Him than any others.''* There is too much truth in this. Too often a denomination feels that in a new and growing town the Lord's work will not be done thoroughly unless it is represented there. However, we trust that this feeling is passing away. Better acquaintance begets confidence, and the denominations are coming to recognize each other's sincerity and efficiency.

Good reader, if you feel that the peculiarities of your denomination are essential to the development of a complete Christian character, that your particular church must preserve its denominational identity in order that the kingdom of Christ may be consummated; or if you are persuaded that sectarianism is not an evil, if you are content to leave the denominations as they are: then it cannot be expected that the next few pages will meet with your approval. But if you recognize that other churches are producing just as good Christians as your own, if you see that sectarian divisions are wasteful of resources, a stumbling-block to an unbelieving world, and a hindrance to the coming of the kingdom; and if, for the sake of unity, you are willing to sacrifice some peculiar form or hobby which you have held dear; then it is likely that in this discussion you will find something of interest.

Unity in Aggressive Evangelism

Earnest men, eager to win conquests for Christ and to extend his kingdom often say, Let the churches of a city unite in a great aggressive campaign to reach the unchurched. Nothing is easier to say; nothing is harder to do.

**The New Era,* p. 315.

The difficulty consists in the fact that in evangelistic work there is more doctrinal preaching than elsewhere. Christians of different denominations can work together very successfully in moral, civic, and philanthropic endeavors, but when they try to win converts by aggressive evangelism they preach doctrines in which it is difficult to agree. Every pastor who has had the experience knows that union evangelistic work is a terrible strain upon the nerves. He wants to be in harmony with the movement, and at the same time he wants to be loyal to his convictions of truth. Some believe in religion by evolution, others in religion by miracle. Some read the history of the old revivals, others study the new psychology. Some appeal to the emotion, others are afraid of hypnotism. Some exhort men to come and get saved, others exhort them to enlist for social service.

Paul says, "Strive not about words to no profit." That is just what we have been doing. While fairly well agreed as to the great essentials of religious experience, we fall into controversy over a few technical terms. There are theological words which smell of smoke and powder. They have occasioned long and bitter controversies. They cause so much misunderstanding and division that, for the sake of clearness and of felicitous coöperation, they should be eliminated from the vocabulary of the evangelist.

For example, the word "conversion" is a troublesome word, because it does not mean the same thing to all Christians. It is used very appropriately to describe a radical change in moral character such as we sometimes witness when a mature man yields himself to Christ. But children frequently come into the Christian life by a quiet process of development, without meeting one distinct crisis of decision. Horace Bushnell set this forth as the ideal: "The child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise." A few years

ago Rev. Jesse Hill, of the Williston Church in Portland, Maine, said: "A child's conversion is a spiritual awakening. His path to God is not to be found in repentance, but in the growing revelation of his love, which calls forth his adoration and joyful consecration. An unbroken spiritual development, running from childhood to manhood is normal." Now some leaders, while recognizing this variety in religious experience, would use the word "conversion" for all the types, understanding that there are different forms of conversion. Others, like Starbuck, prefer to use the term "conversion" only for the more radical and sudden type of experience. The essential thing is that people have a great spiritual experience of fellowship with God. The time and manner of its genesis, and the doctrinal explanation of the experience, are of secondary importance. By all means let us have the spiritual experience of which the preachers have been talking and humble Christians have been testifying, but let us be careful how we label it. Inasmuch as the word "conversion" is confusing, meaning one thing to one person or to one sect, and another thing to another group, it is better to use the term, "awakening of the soul." This term is surely elastic enough to fit all types of experience. The awakening may be quiet and gradual, like the normal intellectual awakening of a child; or, if delayed, it may come later in life in the form of an earthquake shock. If the awakening never comes, there is a fatal sleep. "For the soul is dead that slumbers."

To one man "sanctification" means a gradual process. To another it means the eradication of original sin by a miracle.

To one man "salvation" means something which he obtained yesterday, through a single act of self-surrender. To another it means a process now going on. To

a third, as to Peter, it means something yet to be reached: "that ye may grow thereby unto salvation."*

Enough has been said to show that men are sometimes guilty of sectarianism without knowing it. They think they are sufficiently catholic, while they are presenting their message in a form which is narrow and incomplete, simply because they do not understand the other fellow.

This is no time for spiritual minded men to fall into trivial controversy. We need the coöperation of some devout souls who have not been considered orthodox.

The old theological terms are ambiguous and divisive. The gospel for the twentieth century should not be put up in the old wine-skins of a mediaeval terminology. Let us agree to present our evangelistic message in simple every-day language, so that "the wayfaring man" may understand.

For this purpose a few texts are peculiarly appropriate, because of their simplicity and picturesque beauty. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me." Men who are bewildered by a sermon on the new birth or repelled by a dissertation on vicarious atonemnt may be fascinated and trnsformed by Holman Hunt's picture of Christ knocking at the door. President Henry C. King speaks of the Christian life as a friendship with Jesus. Let the evangelist point out the ways in which Christ comes near to the individual, and then exhort men to receive Him and cultivate his friendship. Best of all is the parable of the Prodigal Son, in which Jesus sets forth in a picture the great doctrines of divine love, sin, repentance, forgiveness and acceptance.

If one thinks it necessary sometimes to utter solemn warnings and set forth the more sombre side of the gos-

*1 Peter 2:2, *American Revised Version.*

pel message, let him use the vivid parables of the unprofitable servant, the barren tree, and the fruitless vine.

Prof. Drummond said, "The new evangelism must not be doctrinal." If evangelists and pastors can lay aside the red rags of old doctrinal controversies and present a simple earnest appeal in non-technical language, they will be able to lead the churches in a great forward movement which will win the men of today and prove that we are

"One in hope and doctrine,
One in charity."

Sacramental Unity

A valuable contribution to the subject under discussion is the little book by Dr. Charles W. Eliot entitled, "The Road to Unity Among the Christian Churches." He shows that the feelings which lead to worship are universal, "but the symbols, rites, and observances to which these feelings give rise are rather divisive than unifying." Furthermore, "Sacred observances and ceremonials, and other traditional rites in religious worship, have been extremely divisive through the whole history of our race." A fair inference is that in order to find the road to unity we must put less emphasis upon "symbols, rites, and ceremonials."

One phase of this subject has not received adequate attention. Either men do not see it, or else they are afraid to face it. The most bitter controversies have been the sacramental controversies. The most serious hindrances to church unity today are found in connection with the sacraments. This is a great pity, for the sacraments were intended to bring Christians together, not to divide them. It is good to note that we are making progress even here. We have recently heard of union services during Holy Week, including a communion service on Thursday evening, in which Methodists, Congre-

gationalists, Baptists, Universalists, and perhaps others, have participated. It is significant also that the denominations which succeed best in experiments of federation or coöperation are not those which agree in doctrine or polity, but those which can best come together in the sacraments, or which put little emphasis upon the sacraments, notably the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, in Canada.

The unity of the church is more important than any sacrament. This may seem like a radical statement, but in the present crisis of the church we need to make radical statements and drive them home. In the gospel of John we find no reference to the Lord's Supper, but we do find the prayer of Jesus, "that they may all be one." The Friends have proven by experiment that some Christians can develop a fine type of spirituality without the sacraments. The brazen serpent was a symbol of salvation, but when it became an idol Hezekiah destroyed it. The most sacred thing may become a stumbling-block. If we cannot agree in the observance of the sacraments, it would be better to agree in the non-observance.

But the suggestion just made is almost an impossibility. Few churches at present would be ready to give up the sacraments, and probably it is not necessary. It is time to consider earnestly how the sacraments, which have too often been the source of division, may be made a basis of union. In considering possible adjustments we should remember that it is always easier to give up an old rite than to take on a new one. Therefore it is to be expected that our progress will be in the direction of simplicity.

In most denominations Baptism is the initiatory rite whereby persons are received into the church. The most serious controversy has been over the question whether the rite shall be applied to infants, or only to those who are able to coöperate with their intelligence and will in

the making of a covenant. In recent times the question has been greatly simplified by the fact that the more liberal churches are no longer attempting to connect Baptism with the historic doctrine of regeneration, but are regarding it chiefly as the symbol of consecration. The Baptism of an infant means that the parents dedicate their child to the Lord, in the same spirit in which Hannah dedicated Samuel. The Baptism of an adult means the consecration of self. And we have a right to expect that in either case God will show His acceptance of the covenant by bestowing spiritual power and insight. Whether the public consecration of infants by Baptism will prevail more or less in the church of the future, remains to be seen. For the present any denomination may very properly leave it to the option of each family.

Regarding the mode of Baptism, only a few words are necessary. There is honest difference of opinion among Christians, and those who differ recognize the sincerity and Christian character of one another. It would be a very reasonable arrangement, and apparently feasible, to say that each individual can be baptized in the manner which his own conscience approves; and that people who, in obedience to their individual conscience, have been baptized in different ways can be members of the same church. When such an arrangement is made, by mutual consent, Baptism will no longer be a divisive sacrament. It will be restored to its rightful place in the administration of the church. It is a God-given and beautiful rite. We do well to retain it, because the covenant of consecration is important and necessary and a proper symbol helps to make it impressive.

We need not take up the long and unfortunate controversies which have been waged over the Lord's Supper, that beautiful feast of Christian fellowship which was instituted by the Master. Undoubtedly the importance of this sacrament has been exaggerated by some very

zealous Christians who magnify the value of a symbol. The Quaker poet taught us a valuable truth:

> "Nor holy bread, nor blood of grape,
> The lineaments restore
> Of Him we know in outward shape
> And in the flesh no more.
>
> "The letter fails, and systems fall,
> And every symbol wanes;
> The Spirit over-brooding all
> Eternal Love remains."*

But most Christians find a real blessing in this sacrament, and it may be used effectively to promote the fellowship of Christians, when observed according to "the simplicity that is in Christ," without the accretions of excessive ritualism.

In seeking for a basis of unity here, a very simple rule can be suggested, which clearly looks toward catholicity and Christian liberty. Let all denominations enter into an agreement that each church will respect the discipline of every other church. This would mean that a person who partakes of the Lord's Supper in his own church shall be free to do so when visiting another church. Thus we should observe common courtesy and Christian principles of conduct toward other churches to the extent of receiving to the Lord's table Christians away from home who habitually partake of the sacrament in their home churches.

The Vital Conditions of Unity

Some reader will discover that the suggestions given above do not offer a complete solution of our problem. Before there can be a sacramental unity it is important that churches should have a uniform standard of membership. To this end, and as a condition of unity in evangelistic work, it is very desirable that we should

*Whittier: *Our Master.*

agree as to the question, "Who is a Christian?" If various answers are given in different localities and in different denominations, then a sacramental unity would be only a mechanical affair, without any real "unity of the spirit."

But how shall we know about a person's inner experience? How shall we recognize a Christian? Sad mistakes have been made. Wrong tests have been applied. We cannot test by the Nicene creed, for some who have been unable to assent to that creed have shown good evidence of a beautiful spiritual experience. Note, for example, the authorship of the hymn, "Nearer, My God, to Thee."

All attempts to sift Christians by their creeds have proved unsatisfactory. We agree with Whittier:

> "The creed may be wrong, but the life may be true,
> And hearts beat the same under drab coats or blue."

Charles Wagner says: "All theories halt, and all catechisms are one-eyed."

Subjective tests have caused grave errors. Speaking of his experience in Georgia, John Wesley said: "What have I learned of myself, meantime? Why, what I the least of all suspected, that I who went to America to convert others, was never myself converted to God." But at the same time Whitefield gave this testimony: "The good that Mr. John Wesley has done in America is inexpressible. His name is very precious among the people. . . . Oh that I may follow him as he has followed Christ." Whitefield knew Wesley better than Wesley knew himself.

Many a good man counts himself outside the family of Christ because he cannot tell the story of his "conversion" in an orthodox manner. Introspection drives many good people to insanity and despair.

The whole subject requires most careful treatment.

We must use discrimination certainly in receiving people to church membership. And we must use great care in our discrimination. There are so many varieties of Christians that we need good eyes to recognize them all. And we need great charity to recognize those who are not according to our style. Generally lack of fellowship is due to lack of recognition. On the whole, it is better to be too broad than too narrow. While we cannot enter into minute details or lay down definite rules for judgment, we may say in general that one is a Christian who recognizes the ideal of partnership with God and who is devoting himself to the business of making men happy. Or, to make it as simple as possible, we may say that a Christian is one who goes to school to Jesus.

There is one more condition of unity. Phillips Brooks uttered a great truth when he said, "In all friendship there must be surrender." Unity can be accomplished only by the surrender of peculiar tastes, by the abandonment of pet theories and hobbies. A writer in *The Churchman* says: "Fortunately we have passed the stage when there will be any attempt to unite the church on the basis of each denomination's surrendering its distinctive elements and agreeing on a sort of minimum; a proposal that would leave us with a religion reduced to its lowest and least interesting features." This is a naive confession that many Christians regard their sectarian hobbies as the most interesting part of their religion. It is to be earnestly hoped that we have not "passed the stage" aforesaid; for the possibility of union is in the "minimum." If men of different denominations are to unite in evangelistic work, each must give up methods and doctrines which are peculiar and divisive and adopt those in which all can work together. In order to accomplish a sacramental unity whatever in our own observance of the sacraments is peculiar or sectarian must yield to that which is catholic.

And if some one discovers that such a plan for unity would eliminate everything in particular for which his denomination stands, then let him consider carefully whether his denomination should not surrender its identity in order that the ideal of his Lord and Master may be realized. Let the will of the Lord be done, no matter what becomes of our pleasant associations and fond memories.

The Prophet's Dream

A man of God sat up late one night lamenting the division of Christians and puzzling over the possibility of union. At length he fell asleep and dreamed a dream.

He was in a thriving village of five thousand inhabitants. It was Easter morning, in the year 1960. He heard two bell chimes, on the same key. One came from St. Peter's Cathedral, the other from the Church of Christian Brethren. He followed the latter, and came to a large edifice, beautiful but simple. Over the door was a motto, its gilt letters illuminated by the rising sun, THAT THEY MAY ALL BE ONE. The usher pointed out two chapels, in each of which a sunrise service was about to be held.

He spent a few minutes in each chapel. In the first were about a hundred and fifty persons. A boy choir rendered "Nicaea" as a processional. A surpliced reader conducted the service, and the people responded from a prayer book. In the other chapel about the same number of people sang together some simple gospel melodies. Impromptu prayers were offered, and cheerful testimonies were given. Thus Christians with differing tastes began the day by meeting their Lord in the place of prayer.

A notice in the vestibule announced the morning worship at 10:30. The prophet came early to this service. The large audience room was soon filled with two thou-

sand people. The form of worship was simple. The congregation sang familiar hymns. Early in the service a hundred candidates were received into fellowship. Most of them were young people between the ages of fifteen and twenty. With the exception of about a dozen, they received Baptism, kneeling at the altar. Before this the pastor gave a brief address, explaining the meaning of Baptism as the symbol of a solemn covenant in which each person expresses the deliberate consecration of himself and believes that the Holy Spirit ratifies the covenant. The effect upon the congregation of this scene when such a goodly number in the dew of their youth devoted themselves to the Master, was such as the prophet had never seen, not even in a great revival meeting. Then the pastor preached a short sermon on Christian fellowship, which was followed by the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The bread was passed among the congregation, followed by the individual cups. In this ceremony two things impressed the prophet: the reverent demeanor of those who seemed to be sitting in the presence of the Lord, and the glad fellowship of a multitude breaking bread together.

Desiring to know more about this church, the prophet lingered to talk with the assistant pastor. He was informed that the class which was admitted to membership had been receiving special instruction for three months. In answer to a question concerning those who did not receive Baptism, the informant said that a few of them had been baptized in infancy, and the others had been baptized by immersion in the chapel the day before.

The assistant pastor then told a long story of the work of this church, and of the history which led up to the union of six little sectarian churches. He showed the prophet the Sunday school rooms, with all manner of new features. He told him of the deaconness work, of the boys' clubs, and the industrial classes. The church

parlors and class rooms were open every evening. The men did not join the popular fraternities, for the center of their social life was the church and its Brotherhood. In reply to a question concerning the morning chapel where the ritual was used, the narrator said those people were brought up in the Episcopal Church. In the first years after the merger they held an early communion service in the chapel; but after a time they came to appreciate the value of the larger fellowship in the sacrament. They retained the early morning worship with the ritual, and this was recognized by the whole church as contributing to the reverent observance of the day.

The prophet returned in the evening, and looked into the different services which were held at the same hour. In the ritualistic chapel there was a vesper service, with choice music. In the other chapel was an informal service, resembling a Methodist class-meeting. The leader gave a heart talk on the deeper spiritual life; the people told some of their experiences, and asked questions concerning their difficulties. A number of irreligious people who had been brought into this service were persuaded by the personal workers to remain and talk with the leader. One of the workers told the prophet that new names were added to the inquirers' class every week. At the same hour three mission study classes were held in the Sunday school rooms. In the front part of the audience room about five hundred men listened to a lecture in which an expert from the city applied the teachings of the New Testament to questions of social economy. One of the church officers told the prophet that different subjects were treated at this service; during the winter there was usually an evangelistic sermon, followed by an inquiry meeting.

As the prophet left the church that night, he felt that the Christian Brethren had solved the problem of church

union. Here was variety in unity. Christians of different types had an opportunity to indulge and cultivate their particular tastes; but in the morning worship there was the enthusiasm of a multitude, and those people of differing abilities and dispositions found a real fellowship in the sacraments.

When the prophet awoke from his dream, he thought he had been half way to heaven.

William C. Clark.

Congregational Parsonage,
Bakersfield, Vermont.

YOKE-FELLOWS

Must I then bear this burden,
Lift such a crushing weight;
How may I go upon my way,
Beneath a load so great?

I lay it on my shoulders
With groanings and with pain;
I must obey and cannot stay,
But hasten on again.

How strange it is my burden
Has grown so light and small;
The yoke lies even on my neck,
It chafes me not at all.

But there is One beside me
Who shares my load with me;
So little does it hamper
That I am strong and free.

"Yoke-fellow," says my Partner,
"Let not your task affright,
For My yoke to wear is easy,
My burden it is light."

—*Kate A. Maxwell.*

THE MORAL TEST FOR FUTURE LIFE

THERE are few questions upon which the voice of the church has grown more uncertain of late, than the question of human destiny beyond this life. With the decay of the older conceptions of the character of hell as a place of material torment, and with the return of a clearer vision of the majesty and passion of divine mercy, there has been a corresponding tendency to blunt the edge of that moral issue upon which the Christian gospel plainly insists. It is urgently necessary for us to get a clearer conception of what the teaching of Jesus involves positively in regard to the future life. It is interesting therefore, to recall a pregnant little sentence which occurs in Christ's reply to the Sadducees concerning the future life and which throws into sharp relief the existence of a moral condition as governing the soul's position in the next world. In this memorable passage, as reported by St. Luke, in his twentieth chapter, Jesus speaks of those *"who are accounted worthy to attain to that world."* When we associate that very definite statement with His teaching about divine judgment, the separating of the sheep from the goats, of the undeserving rich from the deserving poor, we are face to face with a very stern challenge to our modern easy-going views of morality. Plainly, for Jesus, character does determine destiny. We may contrast this with certain widespread and growing notions concerning the significance of ethics.

Ethics, we are being freely told today, are just the *"mores"* of society, its agreed customs of conduct. Humanity has found by experience that to live together in such and such a way is safer, more useful, ultimately more pleasant, and thus the conventions of modern society, by long evolution, have arisen. Conscience in

the individual is simply the inherited pressure of those majority decisions of the past.

Upon this basis ethics are a purely human expedient for permitting human beings to dwell together in communities. "Godliness is profitable *for this world.*" But if a man is really courageous he will probably defy convention. It is one of the few outlets for moral heroism in our very conventional modern existence. These majority-preferences ignore very ruthlessly the rights of minorities, and often show scant respect for the peculiarities and difficulties in which the individual finds himself. Even where there is no definite theory such as this to determine action and inspire result, morality has come to mean for many a deadly, dull routine of behavior, so unspiced by danger, and so unromantic in meaning that for sheer ennui the soul flirts with sin.

The question must inevitably arise upon such a theory of ethics as to whether it is not intrinsically nobler to be immoral than moral. If morality is only the will of the majority, is it not a clear case of the coercion of the freedom of the individual, a subtle form of "might is right"?

It is to this impasse that the merely humanistic theory of morals inevitably leads. There is one significant fact, however, which shatters this view completely. Progress in morality has historically been due not to mass-judgments but to the inspired vision of individuals. How does one explain the moral pioneer if before conscience can exist there must be the pressure of a widespread social habit? And if the moral progress of mankind has been due to an Abraham, a Moses, a Socrates, an Elijah, a St. Francis, a Wilberforce, a Lloyd Garrison, whence came their inspiration? There is no answer, but that the conscience of man reflects increasingly by progressive development the mind of the Creator.

It is interesting in this respect to reflect upon the way

in which all creation seems to conspire to press upon mankind, always and everywhere, the moral issue. The use or misuse of his own being is a matter of travail for every soul, a travail that no life escapes. A man's relation to others is also being constantly balanced between right and wrong development. No one escapes the issue. His relation to science has, especially in our own day, revealed the same problem. Shall he prostitute his knowledge to the service of evil or exalt it in devotion to the good? A man makes no new discovery in any realm but the moral issue follows him to plague him with its eternal question. Every soul carries deep within it always and everywhere an instinct that answers with rapture or with terror according to the verdict Right! or Wrong! Truly might Shakspeare write, "Conscience doth make cowards of us all." Man is incurably ethical and he is so because he is the offspring of a vitally moral universe. The supreme issue in life is the moral one. This view is plainly endorsed by Jesus. Indeed it is the very heart of His teaching. Man needs to be redeemed into the character of God. He can only be thus redeemed by making certain definite choices of temper and behavior. The gospel that Jesus brings is the good news that grace is available for the making and the retention of such choices. "If a man love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come in to him and make our abode with him." The virtues, truth, justice, purity, love, in the view of Jesus, constitute the character of God, and for that reason are the structural foundation of the universe. Nothing can last indefinitely in which this character is not incorporated. Just as that building cannot stand which is built contrary to the laws of architecture, so no house of life, individual or social, can stand in which these structural principles are not observed. "Except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it." "If a man do my

words I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock."

If Jesus is right the universe is ethical and we may expect that its ethical nature should become particularly evident at the main crises of life. All the vital processes of life are accompanied by intense spiritual sensations and strong activity of conscience. Let the reader judge by his own experience. Sex is the pivot point of the moral issue in life. Man has always instinctively felt this to be so. Accordingly, birth, puberty, marriage, from primitive times have been hallowed by some kind of sacrament and surrounded with all the mystic solemnity that man could devise. It was the solemnity of those vital interests that made the sacraments, not the sacraments that made the solemnity. Jesus teaches us that similarly the vital process of death will be an occasion of moral judgment and that the future life is conditioned by the character that we achieve here. Our character meets the divine judgment at death. It is useful to give to this word judgment a rather simpler meaning that it usually bears for us. We must escape the sense of a legal assize set in the atmosphere of a celestial law-court, and think rather of God's *opinion*, or *preference*, his appraisement of values, what He *thinks* about things. That preference runs concurrently with our life, permeates the universe in which He is immanent, expresses itself continually within us as conscience, according to the measure of our intelligence, meets us outwardly in the recurring crises to which human affairs inevitably move, and awaits us at last in clearer degree at the portals of a higher and more illuminated existence. Does any soul ever depart this life with any time for thought without realizing as never before what are the true values for which his being was given, without, that is, meeting his God in judgment? "And after death the judgment." It is with a clearer

vision of himself and of all things that every soul knocks at the celestial gate.

These are facts that need to be preached. Whatever the character of heaven, whatever the character of hell, the soul of the one is to be *right,* the soul of the other is to be *wrong.* We need to get upon the conscience of our modern community the solemnity and the magnitude of the supreme issue—moral character or Godlikeness. How can that which does not correspond to reality hope to last? How can that which is harmonious with the supremely real ever be destroyed? "The gift of God is eternal life." Wherever then we find a moral test in life the issues are far more than those of the moment. They determine our place beyond death.

It is necessary, however, to distinguish here between the words "immortality" and "eternal life." There is no need, in the present writer's view, to take the teaching of Jesus as endorsing conditional immortality, viz.: the doctrine that moral fitness is necessary for survival. His sense of the infinite value of each separate soul was too intense and passionate for Him to be reconciled to the scrapping of any soul, however depraved. It is incredible that the divine mercy can have a time limit set to it, and therefore *endless continuity for every soul* must be in the will of God as one of the conditions of His eventual victory. In the sentence that Jesus used there is a sense of stepping up, of rising from the dead "those who are accounted worthy to attain that world." It is to the achievement of a higher life that He sets this moral condition. It would be a poor reward for moral victory to simply perpetuate life with no reference to the quality of its existence. The gift of God is not mere immortality. That, especially for the degraded soul would be an appalling prospect. "The gift of God is eternal life." We know now the value of that word "eternal." It stands for quality rather than quantity,

for life that is not merely endless but is intrinsically indestructible because it is perfect. "He that doeth the will of God abideth forever."

Human society is often divided conventionally, in respect of moral condition, into worlds. We speak of those who belong to the "underworld," the "demi-monde." Even so might Jesus speak of those who are worthy to attain that "world." For every soul death will be either a stepping on or a stepping up. Death is a supreme moral crisis. The "light that never was on land or sea" shines then upon each soul's problem and state and in God's light he sees—what? Is not that sufficient issue still to make the unprepared soul quake with dread and the dedicated heart to thrill with rapture? Before every soul there lies at death a prospect of the heaven of a completer harmony with God or the hell of a continued, painful fundamental jangle and discord. We do not need to get back to the crude and harsh theology that swayed the minds of a rougher and more cruel age. We need only to face up to the facts of life as they are plainly indicated, and to the solemnities of our own being as they are plainly felt in the sober reflective moments of life. Hell is still hell; indeed, since our view of it is now truer it is more hell than ever it was. Heaven is still heaven, and since our view now is truer, more heavenly than we dreamed. God is still God and man is still His child, and the question still remains, is he prodigal and feeding upon the husks of life in the far country, dead while he lives, or is he home in the Father's House, for ever safe in the renewed harmony of One spirit and One way of life? Studdert Kennedy has flung this supreme moral of life issue into unforgettable words in a little, but heart-searching poem. It purports to describe the experience of one who fell asleep and dreamed of judgment:

'Twere all men's face, yet no man's face,
And a face no man could see;
Yet it seemed to say, in a silent speech,
"You did them all to me."

"The dirty things you did to them,
The filth you thought so fine;
You did them all to me," it said,
"For all their souls are mine."

And then, at last, he said one word ,
He said just one word, "Well?"
And I said in a trembling voice;
"Please, can I go to Hell?"

"You can't; that hell is for the blind,
And not for those that see.
You know you have earned it, lad,
So you must follow me.

"Follow me in the paths of pain,
Seeking what you have seen,
Until at last you can build the IS
With the bricks of MIGHT HAVE BEEN."

I've got to follow what I've seen,
Till this old body dies,
For I daren't face, in the land of grace,
The sorrow of those eyes.

A. D. Belden.

Crowstone Congregational Church,
Westcliff-on-Sea, England.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

THE Committee on the World Conference on Faith and Order sends out the following bulletin:

Everywhere Christians are recognizing that the only hope of the world is the establishment of Christ's law of peace and righteousness and love, and that, until the churches are visibly united, they cannot proclaim that law effectively. Local efforts for partial reunion are, therefore, being made all over the globe, and the effort for the World Conference on Faith and Order, to prepare the way for the unity of the churches, is arousing increased interest.

In Canada, the Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians have reached almost the final stage of union, and Methodists and Anglicans are appointing Commissions to confer.

In England, members of the Church of England and of the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Moravian and Presbyterian Churches held remarkable conferences last winter.

In Australia, Anglicans, Baptists, Christians, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians are discussing the matter seriously.

The South India United Church and the Church of England are continuing their hopeful negotiations.

The Presbyterians, Church of England, Methodists, Congregationalists and other missionaries are continuing their efforts at Kikuyu in East Africa. Informal discussions are going on in the West Indies.

The Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland have almost completed their reunion.

In China a National Christian Council has been formed by members, foreign and native, of most of the Christian Missions which it is hoped will prepare the way for direct efforts for one Church in China.

In Egypt, members of the Church of England and the Greek Orthodox, Coptic, Syrian Orthodox, Armenian and Presbyterian Churches are continuing hopeful conferences.

In Ireland the Presbyterians and the Church of Ireland are considering the matter.

The recognition by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Churches of the validity of Anglican orders is a long step toward reunion between the Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Anglican Communion. The decision of the Ecumenical Patriarchate will need the assent of the other Patriarchates and autonomous Eastern Orthodox Churches before it becomes effective. The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Old Catholic Churches of Europe are approaching each other, and the relations between the Eastern Orthodox and the Armenian and Coptic Churches are closer.

Viscount Halifax has been having conversations with Cardinal Mercier as to reunion between the Churches of Rome and England.

In the United States the Episcopal Church has made canonical provisions by which its Bishops will be enabled to give to ordained ministers of other Churches an Episcopal commission.

While federation is not a substitute for unity, it is a step toward it, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is becoming more and more effective. The Federal Council of the Free Churches in England is likewise gaining in importance and efficiency, and federation movements are well advanced in Germany and Switzerland.

The Northern and Southern bodies in the United States of the Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists are still continuing their negotiations. Two of the largest bodies of Lutherans in the United States have united under the name of the United Lutheran Church in America, and the Evangelical Association of North America and the United Evangelical Church have just united under the name of the Evangelical Church, which has voted to destroy all records of the division which separated them many years ago.

The World Conference on Faith and Order, 174 Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, U. S. A., has published, for free distribution to all who apply, pamphlets reporting some of these efforts and explaining the World Conference movement toward Christian Reunion, and a list in English, French, German and Greek of topics for the consideration of groups of Christians as preliminary to the approach to unity.

The interest in Christian Reunion is especially keen in England. The Secretary has been receiving each week this autumn from fifty to one hundred cuttings on the subject from English papers. For instance, in the last week, that ending November 18, there came sixty-five, twenty-eight from religious and thirty-seven from secular papers, aggregating one thousand inches of space.

Dr. Alva W. Taylor, writing in *The Christian Work*, New York, on "The Rural Parson," says:

The farmer is confronted with four or five churches, all of which must be weak because there are not enough people to go around. His neighbors are members of these churches and he knows they are just as conscientious as he is and that no good thing ever comes out of compromised convictions. He knows all the "railroad" parsons that come on various Sundays to preach, and he knows they are all preaching according to their convictions and getting much less than a living for it as a rule. He finds, however, that nine-tenths of their talk is about the same things and that the tenth in which they differ has little to do with living or making a living or a better life. He looks upon the $10,000 invested in five church

houses and sees that there is not one of them in which a Sunday school can be conducted in an orderly manner or anything else under the sun done but hold a preaching service, and he thinks what a fine church building that ten thousand would give the community. He counts up the combined stipends of five once-a-month preachers and says to himself that it would be easy to add them all together and put fifty per cent on for one good seven days a week pastor. He totals the attendance at the five Sunday schools and counts over their inefficiencies and makes a safe guess that if all were in one there would be enthusiasm and something done and that most of the children that go to none would come in.

Then he takes an invoice of community assets and bethinks himself that the slogan of the time is "get together;" that while better roads, better telephones, better markets are all bringing co-operation into the community, the church, the one institution from which brotherhood should be most preached, is really the only institution left from which division proceeds. Then he asks why it is not common sense to get together on the nine things in which all agree, allowing each to hold to the tenth in which they do not. He asks why they cannot co-operate in church as they do in school, at good roads meetings or through the co-operative selling club. In all these they agree in some things and agree to disagree in others but to be good fellows in all. It is tragical to find that in so many cases the man who should lead in fraternal and co-operative enterprises, just because he is a preacher of the Gospel of Brotherhood, thinks that the differences are more important than the common agreements. Both religion and morals may languish in the community, and even his own church die but he will not venture on such co-operation. Until the country gets more than the old creedal preaching there seems to be no remedy in sight. It is now getting more than it will pay for, though it can pay more for real religious service.

In one of the best counties in Missouri only one-fourth of the population belongs to any church at all and only about one-half of the children are in Sunday school. The churches have been there in plenty ever since folks came nearly a century ago and missionary money is still being sent there. The land is good and everything else is keeping up with the times, but one-third of the rural churches are already dead and few of the others are making any progress, while the town churches are thriving. In another rich mid-Missouri county there are 105 churches with seventy-two of them in the rural parts, or one to every 200 population. It takes about 200 members to make a church go right but the average membership is about 70, and one-half of those are inactive. Not a single open country church has a pastor and many of them do not even have preaching. A number are dead, others are dying and none have more than once a month sermons by an absentee preacher. There are not a half dozen live Sunday schools in them all. Every other rural institution, except the church, is progressing. Yet there is not one of these communities that could not furnish as good a church as any town in the country if only enough

people would get together and get as good a leader as the town church has.

While the richer sections of most of the states are over-churched until all the churches are weak and inefficient there are less favored sections where there are no churches. In the measure that progressive-minded men awaken to the facts and begin to consider church business as they do other business they will devise ways and means to overcome the weakness of church divisiveness and to make the rural church function in the life of the modern rural community.

Speaking editorially *The Congregationalist,* Boston, says:

On the evening of October 12, in connection with the 250th anniversary of the First Church of Danvers, Congregational, a unique gathering was held in behalf of Christian unity. Here in this parish trials for witchcraft first took place in America, and the pastor, Rev. Albert V. House, had determined that some fine manifestation of enlightenment and progressiveness on this anniversary occasion should counteract the unwholesome memory of darker days.

Four speakers, from four different denominations, were asked to speak on the general theme: *Obstacles to Unity, How to Overcome Them.* An interesting feature of the program was a hymn following each address by a writer of the same denomination as the speaker, with the apparent suggestion that in our hymnbooks we have already attained something of the ideal possible for the whole life of the church. The four speakers were: Rev. Prof. Samuel McComb, D.D., Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge; Rev. A. G. Dieffenbach, D.D., editor, *The Christian Register,* Unitarian; Rev. Prof. Woodman Bradbury, D.D., Baptist Theological Institution, Newton; and the editor of *The Congregationalist.* Of course, each speaker had no authority to represent his denomination, but the viewpoints were none the less notable.

Particularly striking were the statements of the two theological professors, Episcopal and Baptist. The attitudes of the two editors could be fairly well forecasted, but the professors, as it happened, touched very directly upon the very matters that constitute the difficulties of unity in connection with their respective denominations. Professor Bradbury declared in the strongest manner against closed communion, though he suggested that the practice of closed communion had arisen among the Baptists from the righteous purpose of preserving high and holy standards of church membership. His whole address was an uncompromising plea for catholicity of fellowship.

Dr. McComb went to the heart of present controversies when he declared in no uncertain words that in proposals and steps toward unity there must be frank and honest recognition of the validity of the ordination of the

various ministries. He expressed his sense of the unbrotherly and un-Christian character of the demand for Episcopal re-ordination. Also, asserting his personal preference for a ritualistic service, he expressed the opinion that the church of a larger unity must have room for great variety in worship.

It was a notable feature that each speaker referred to the large measure of freedom in his own particular denomination. Can it be that men love and find the same thing under different forms? Is not this in itself one of the strongest arguments for unity?

The writer came from this meeting at Danvers with two outstanding impressions. First of all was a keen sense of the value of such public gatherings as this at Danvers. Meetings like this throughout the land would do much to foster a new spirit. In some communities, we are aware, Unitarians would not find such recognition, but if those who fear to give them the place which the Massachusetts Federation of Churches has already accorded could have heard Dr. Dieffenbach, their fears would have gone far toward removal. The keynote of his address was his story of Martineau's reply to a friend who criticized him for going, as he frequently did, to hear Spurgeon. "You do not believe," said the friend, "what Spurgeon says." "No," replied Martineau, "but Spurgeon does." Sincerity, he rightly suggested, was itself a great bond of union.

The second strong impression was that of the value of keeping open all the avenues of approach and contact between the various denominations. We have never been among those who shared high hopes of present negotiations with the Episcopalians; in fact, we have felt at times that the whole movement was in danger of going in the wrong direction. As we listened to Dr. McComb, however, it became clear how valuable and necessary it is to preserve relations of courtesy and contact. The future of Christian unity does not stand or fall with the Lambeth proposals and the High Church Party. It is essential that there be ever in evidence and effect some movement whereby the men in the different communions who believe in unity on a basis of honest and brotherly recognition of a common Christian experience and purpose, may function toward the attaining of that end. Let us preserve sincerity of conviction, openness of mind, honesty and frankness of utterance, but let us see to it that we display that patience and courtesy which will maintain every possible common meeting-place. Old prejudices are dying; false sanctities are disappearing before the holy sense of larger Christian communion. Great things are still possible.

The union of the Evangelical communions is gratifying. Says *The Continent*, New York:

The Evangelical Association and the United Evangelical Church have consummated an agreement uniting them, and the united organization will

be known as the Evangelical Church. The reunion of the two groups which split in 1894, was made final at the joint general convention of the two denominations recently in Detroit. The Evangelical Association was organized in the early part of the nineteenth century as a result of the evangelistic activities of Jacob Albright among the German communities of Pennsylvania. He worked under the Methodist church, and it was not his purpose to found a new sect, but the language situation and the opposition to the organization of German Methodist churches on the part of Methodist leaders resulted in the denomination being organized.

The United Evangelical Church broke off from its parent body in 1894 as a result of differences of opinion as to what were considered fundamental principles of church policy and official acts affecting the claims of a large minority of the ministers and members of the association. The Evangelical Association had approximately 1,850 churches with 160,000 members, and the United Evangelical Church had, according to a recent report, 892 churches and 90,000 members. Records of the schism which resulted in the split of the denomination thirty years ago are to be expunged.

Recently Meletios, patriarch of Constantinople, addressed the following letter to the archbishop of Canterbury:

Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and Chief Hierarch of all England—Brother, beloved and yearned-for in Christ our God, Lord Randall, greetings; your reverence well-beloved by us, fraternally in the Lord, we address you with gladness.

Our special committee dealing with the union of the churches has drawn our attention and that of our Holy Synod to the question of the validity of Anglican ordinations from the Orthodox point of view; for that it would be profitable in regard to the whole question of union that the opinion of the Holy Orthodox Church should be known upon this matter.

Accordingly the Holy Synod on this opportunity have taken under our presidency the matter under consideration, and having examined it from every point of view have concluded that as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal confession of bishops, priests and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the charisma of the priesthood derived from apostolic succession.

Indeed, on the one hand, it is plain that there is no matter here as yet of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church. For it is necessary that the rest of the Orthodox Churches should be found to be of the same opinion (in the matter) as the Most Holy Church of Constantinople.

But even so, it is an event not without significance that the synod of one, and that the primatial throne, of the Orthodox Churches, when taking the matter into consideration has come to this conclusion.

Therefore, with great joy we communicate the matter to your beloved Grace as the chief hierarch of the whole Anglican Church, being sure that your grace will be equally favorably disposed towards this conclusion as recognizing in it a step forward in that work of general union which is dear to God.

May the Heavenly Father grant us to be of the same mind, through the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ who is blessed forever and ever.

Your well beloved grace's beloved brother in Christ and altogether well disposed. MELETIOS.

The Living Church, Milwaukee, comments upon the foregoing letter as follows:

The above letter is published on the authority of Germanos, metropolitan of Thyateira and Exarch of Western Europe, the representative in London of the ecumenical patriarchate. It was brought to London from Constantinople by the Rev. W. Emhardt, Director of the Foreign Missions Board of the American Episcopal Church, and was handed by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury last month. Mr. Emhardt will in due course also present a copy of it to the General Convention of the American Church, which has for some time been concerned with the regulation of the admission to its ministrations of those Orthodox in its jurisdiction who are outside access to their own clergy. The acceptance of Anglican ordinations was, of course, a necessary preliminary to such regularization, which, since the Greek colonies in America are dependent on the ecumenical patriarchate, is now possible.

It may be noted here that:

(1) The decision, which has not been made swiftly but after many years of patient and thorough investigation, places Anglican Orders on a parity with Roman Catholic, etc. This is the most which the Orthodox can do, seeing that Orthodox theologians do not recognize the validity *per se* of any sacraments outside the Orthodox Church.

(2) Before the decision becomes that of the whole Orthodox Church, the assent of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and Russia, as well as of the churches of Cyprus, the Kingdom of Greece, Jugo Slavia, Roumania, and Czecho Slovakia will be needed. The political estrangement of Constantinople from Alexandria and the Kingdom of Greece and the state of Russia may delay the assent of those three churches. That of the others will probably be given in the near future.

(3) There is no present probability of other than emergency intercommunion between the Anglican and Orthodox churches. Full intercommunion must wait for complete dogmatic agreement. But the Constantinople decision will open the door to a very close understanding between

the two churches, and may well produce a real solidarity between them, the effect of which will prepare the way for future agreement.

Commenting on both utterances, *The Antidote,* Peeksville, N. Y., says:

Whether the other Orthodox patriarchates of the Near East together with the independent national churches of Orthodoxy will follow the lead of the patriarch of Constantinople in concluding "that as before the Orthodox Church the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal confession of bishops, priests and deacons possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian churches possess," remains to be seen.

Directly this decision of Meletios will not alter Rome's judgment concerning Anglican orders as pronounced by Pope Leo XIII, yet indirectly the action of the present patriarch of Constantinople may result in a generation or two in altering entirely the status of the Anglican Communion relatively to the apostolic see, which is the divinely established center of Catholic unity. Should intercommunion be realized between Canterbury and Constantinople it is to be presumed that the Eastern prelates will take all necessary precautions not to bring into doubt the validity of their ordinations in the eyes of Rome by submitting their own candidates for Holy Orders to the laying on of hands of those whose orders Rome has condemned, while on the other hand in order to secure orders that Rome can no longer gainsay it is more than probable that the Anglicans will somehow manage to have their future bishops consecrated by Orthodox prelates and thus it may come to pass in the course of a generation or two that the entire body of Anglican ministers will have received orders which Rome in the interests of reunion can really recognize as valid without altering in the least the judgment passed by Pope Leo XIII upon Anglican orders as they now exist.

A further comment is quoted from *Evangelical Christendom,* London, as follows:

The widely-signed declaration of a common faith held by Anglicans and Greeks has met with a full reply from Canon Headlam, whose knowledge of both Churches cannot be disputed. He says, "The declaration is really an attempt to present the Church of England in the clothes of the Greek Church. As one Greek friend of mine said:—'It is worse than the sort of things our people write.' 'It suggests that we are to be enabled to unite with the Eastern Church by pretending that we agree with them on a number of points on which the teaching of the Church of England is different.' To members of the Eastern Church it will appear that if we are a body with no traditions of our

own which can only masquerade in the clothes of others, it will be hardly worth while continuing to have dealings with us.'' These are strong words. They are justified by the language of the declaration and the facts of history. Pretense is always bad; it is never worse than when it has to do with great church questions, in which matters of Truth are involved. All who work for union, whether they be Episcopalians or Non-Episcopalians, must be prepared to place common honesty in the very foreground of their policy, to shirk no truth because it is unpleasant to acknowledge the facts as they are, and to avoid by the use of cunning phraseology, closing their understanding to vital matters which cannot possibly be sidetracked. Let us by all means strive to see what is good and true in our brethren who differ from us, but never let us forget that we as children of the light must walk in the light, and by so doing make plain to others that the light that is in us is not darkness. Anything that appears to be camouflage does infinitely more harm than good, and whether it is consciously or unconsciously applied by a section of the church it is certain in the long run to do much more harm than good. We must never forget that although we are earthen vessels we are also stewards of the mysteries of God, and must be faithful in our stewardship. This is all-important in the consideration of Reunion.

The Lambeth Appeal received caustic criticism at the hands of an English Free Churchman, according to *The Christian Century*, Chicago, which says:

No critic of the recently elaborated plan for union which has been worked out by the bishops of the Angelican church and the Free churchmen is more caustic than Dr. T. Rhonda Williams, pastor of the Congregational church at Brighton. He shows that the requirement of baptism bars the Quakers and the Salvation Army from the union plan. The exclusion of the Quakers particularly grieves this Congregational writer. His estimate of the whole document is that it is disingenuous, covering up difficulties with clever phrases rather than facing them with constructive thinking. His criticism will doubtless have large influence in the making of opinion on this matter in England. He says: ''When the report discusses the nature of the ministry it shows that the concession made by Free churchmen is the acceptance of the Episcopate, and Anglicans seem to concede the retention of the Presbyterian and Congregational orders with bishops who shall be representative and constitutional. How this is to be done is not explained, and is certainly not clear. The authority of the whole body is to be given to a minister in ordination by a bishop. And yet our Free church negotiators assure us that they have not consented to be reordained, and the interim report does not speak

of reordination. But whether it means that only men coming into the ministry in the future are to be ordained by a bishop, one cannot tell. To me it is not at all clear how a Congregational minister could remain a Congregational minister and yet make an ordination vow to obey his superior officers, which I suppose would be the case in ordination by a bishop. These points are not at all elucidated in the report.

"All I can say is that I shall go to the end of my day without reordination. The conference was agreed that the various ministers which had grown up in the different denominations have been 'manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit.' In that case I cannot see why the Anglican church should not use them as they are. If they are good enough for God, they surely ought to be good enough for Anglicans.

"As to creeds, we find that the Apostles' creed is to be used at the baptismal service and the Nicene creed to be accepted as a sufficient statement of the corporate faith in Christ of the United church. It is carefully said, however, that 'a reasonable liberty of interpretation' is to be granted. We know quite well what this means in practice. It means prevarication. We subscribe to certain words as an objective standard of truth, and yet we are at liberty to interpret them quite differently. Where, in that case, is the objective standard? Why should the church make ministers take vows in certain words and phrases when they cannot mean what the words convey to the ordinary man?

"One of the negotiators told me that what brought him to consent to the acceptance of the Nicene creed in this report was the ingenious way in which one of the bishops explained that taking the Nicene creed only meant that we were to express a sort of loyalty to the church, which adopted the creed in the fourth century! If that is not a shuffle, I do not know what the word means. The time has surely arrived when it is necessary for the church to be absolutely sincere and honest in its message. To keep on repeating old creeds when we do not half believe them is not honest, and it cannot be good for the spirit of the man who does it, or anybody else. If this is the price at which to buy unity, I am quite certain that many of us are not going to pay it. The real way to unity is to lay the emphasis on spiritual religion and the good life, not on doctrinal or ecclesiastical considerations at all. Earnestness in the former and freedom in the latter is the real way to secure that unity of the spirit which is the only bond of peace."

By the action of the Protestant Episcopal convention in Portland the concordat, which for the last few years has been very generally discussed by Episcopalians and Congregationalists, was sent to the dump heap. Commenting on it *The Congregationalist,* Boston, says:

The concordat and the proposed canon passed the Episcopal General Convention by a bare constitutional majority of two-thirds, but in order to secure passage, it had to be amended in important particulars. These amendments were introduced by the High Church party, with the deliberate purpose of making the canon unacceptable to Congregationalists, and were reluctantly accepted by the proponents of the canon, who labored with good faith and sincere Christian earnestness to carry the work of their commission to a successful issue.

The canon in the form in which it was finally adopted can have no interest for Congregationalists or ministers of other denominations. It stands as a piece of legislation so crippled by compromises as to be completely ineffective.

To *The Congregationalist* it appears that our own commission has done its work well. It has met in a friendly and Christian spirit the suggestions of closer co-operation with the body of Episcopal churches, and has worthily represented the attitude of our denomination toward that denomination and the Church of Christ at large. The members of the commission of the Episcopal church also appear to us to have been animated by a most worthy spirit. They feel keenly the isolation of their denomination and desire closer working relations with the whole body of Christian churches.

We, therefore, have no regret for the negotiations which this action brings to a conclusion. The Episcopal church has not appointed a commission to continue the negotiations, because it regards this action as final. We also accept it as final. Its passage registers the honest and earnest hope of a large number of Episcopalians for closer fellowship with other Christians. It registers also the deep interest of the Congregational churches in any and every such endeavor, but it does not mark any important movement toward church union, and it will not be necessary for the next National Council to spend much time in its consideration.

The Living Church, Milwaukee, says:

Instead of waiting to secure agreement with the Congregational commission, either by means of an official concordat or otherwise, our own commission went into General Convention, on their own responsibility, with a series of measures which they asked to have incorporated into our laws. These were to provide for a system of mutual relations which the Congregationalists had not accepted.

Knowing the grave anxiety that prevailed among Churchmen by reason of the proposals made in 1919, our commission yet preserved complete silence as to their intentions until their report was presented in General Convention. They had made no effort whatever to secure any general agreement among Churchmen as to a policy to be adopted. Their measures proposed did not agree with the instructions given them. Those measures were so badly conceived and drawn that they were in direct conflict with the constitution in several particulars. They included a whole canon

that had not been suggested in 1919, and which could not, by the most liberal interpretation, be bought into harmony with the constitution.

Their report was presented in both houses fairly early in the session, but no attempt was made to secure consideration in the House of Deputies until the amended action came from the House of Bishops late in the session. The only questions introduced for discussion were on concurrence with that house, the commission's original proposals being unfavorably reported from the committee on canons and never called up for consideration. Neither, so far as we can discover, was the formal minority report of the Bishop of Fond du Lac, a member of the commission, ever presented in the House of Deputies at all.

* * * * * * *

In the House of Deputies, those who spoke for the commission not only fully accepted the amendments of the House of Bishops, but did not even bring the original proposals up for consideration. They allowed the matter to drift into the final days of the session without calling it up. They plainly resented the severe, but well deserved, strictures of the committee on canons and made no attempt whatever to remedy constitutional defects that were pointed out. They listened to warnings as to the perfectly inevitable impassè which they were creating, and treated those warnings as factious or partisan opposition. Those in charge of much more delicate matters, as in revision of the service for the Holy Communion, made the most careful efforts to consider the sensibilities of the minority; the concordat commission did nothing of the kind, and so gradually became the minority themselves.

For the net result of their handling of the delicate diplomatic matters that had been entrusted to them was that, starting with a majority that was willing to amend the constitution in a really dangerous manner, because of the widespread desire that the movement should succeed, they threw away their majority and ended with legislation on our statute book that it is not only absolutely unworkable from any point of view whatever, but will stand there as a monument to the failure of a movement that once promised to be in reality an approach toward unity. And finally, as the concluding blunder, they forgot to ask for the continuance of the Joint Commission, which, therefore, has gone out of existence; and if the Congregationalist commission is willing again to meet those who had accepted this delicate trust, it must be simply as individuals, who have thrown away the right to act officially on behalf of the Church.

* * * * * * *

So ends a chapter in our ecclesiastical history that never ought to have been written. We have treated of the issues raised by the original Concordat sufficiently, in times past, to make it unnecessary to repeat any discussion of them now. Whether, at any stage, there really was hope for a successful outcome of the negotiations on lines that could be acceptable to both parties, we question, but the final outcome might at least have been less regrettable. The fundamental defect was that it treated the

episcopate as a fetish which could make right whatever was wrong, and the priesthood as a trifle that could be put on or off without the slightest embarrassment according to the succeeding whims of the day. Congregationalists would have been as dissatisfied with such a system as Churchmen would have been; and it is not impossible that the curious and unintended manner in which negotiations have been brought to a sudden end is one of those unexplainable interpositions of the Holy Spirit in critical affairs within the Church.

Speaking at the centenary of the Yale Divinity School, Bishop Edwin S. Lines of Newark, N. J., said:

"Sectarianism dies hard; but it is doomed." Deploring the fact that the forces of evil were united, he lamented the fact that the Christian Churches were divided into separate camps. Toleration in religion is well established, and, if the various sects are to be united it will be by the building of a greater house unlike any other house at present. We are like people who live on a one-way street: we have seen things going one way so long that we have come to doubt that things can move in more than one way, or that the way can be made broader. It is the lack of constructive vision that prevents the different denominations from being united.

The causes of disunity have now practically disappeared. One rarely hears now, that the competition between the Churches develops zeal and generous giving. There is, however, competition between the Churches in their efforts to enlarge their congregations, sometimes at the expense of other congregations. The competition to get the membership of those whom society calls "the best people" was unworthy of Christianity. No unity will be reached until those supposedly desiring unity are not content with merely holding conferences. We must make sacrifices. No one can lay out a definite plan for the attainment of unity, but, as time goes on, he believes that people will be more willing to sacrifice the denominational customs and traditions for the sake of the greater ideal.

Christian unity will never come at the expense of religious liberty. The greater unity of the future will provide for many forms of worship. "I have always regretted the confusion the different denominations have caused in the minds of Chinese converts to Christianity," the Bishop said. "The points of disagreement between denominations in the United States do not seem of any consequence to a Chinaman when looked at from his point of view."

BOOK REVIEWS

In 1906, when the American Secretary of State, Mr. Root, visited the Latin American republics he said in Rio de Janeiro, "I bring from my country a special greeting to her elder sisters in the civilization of America." It was a happy phrase of a fact that is usually overlooked, but which Dr. Samuel Guy Inman discusses with a thorough and fascinating comprehension in *Problems in Pan Americanism* (Doran). The first university in America was that of St. Thomas, Santo Domingo, founded in 1538 a hundred years before the founding of Harvard. In 1551 the university of San Marcos, Lima, was founded. Then followed the founding of universities in Mexico in 1553, Bogota in 1572, Cordova in 1613, and Sucre in 1623. All of these had faculties of law, medicine, and theology, and had wide reputation for learning in Europe. The first printing-press in America was set up in 1539 in the City of Mexico. The first book printed in America was printed in Mexico. A literary contest was held in Mexico in 1585 in which 300 poets took part. Before Europe had opened scientific careers to women the Chilean government had opened its courses in medicine and law to women. The slaves of Latin America were freed by gradual processes half a century before they were set free in the United States by war. Other instances are also cited by Dr. Inman in the historic development of Latin America. He brings his story down to present times with the statement that the greatest modern newspaper plant is the magnificent home of *La Prensa* in Buenos Aires.

The distinction between races in Latin America is a distinction of rank or class rather than that of color. Instead of destroying the Indians as we North Americans did they intermarried with them and the average man is much prouder of his Indian blood than of his Spanish ancestry. In spite of the introduction of African slaves there is practically no color line or race problem there; yet the problems of Latin America are serious. There are 18,000,000 of pure blooded Indians, who are objects of general exploitation. About 7,000 families own all of Mexico. In Chile seven per cent of the population holds the tillable land. There is a general feudal system all over Latin America. In addition to the land problem and peonage which goes with it there are only two classes in Latin America—the extremely poor and the extremely rich. The assimilation of the immigrant is another problem. There are 500,000 Italians in Buenos Aires alone. There are great numbers of Germans and Japanese in Brazil, Chile, and other Latin American countries. Marriage is ignored, so that there is a shocking illegitimate birth rate. In Chile it is 38 per cent and in cities like Concepción it is 57 per cent. And there are the economic, educational, moral, and religious problems. Of the total investment in the oil industry in Mexico 97 per cent is held by foreigners. In the beginning education was under

the control of the church; since the republics have been established it has been under the control of the government. Illiteracy, which is very great, is stifling national development. There is need of a higher moral standard in business relations. Romanism and Protestantism are struggling for a place, but there is a large element hostile to religion.

Bolivar is the father of Pan Americanism. He belongs with Washington as Juarez of Mexico belongs with Lincoln. This policy of American unity has been the ideal of the greatest of the South American statesmen. It was a forerunner of the League of Nations. The first "American Congress" met at Lima in 1847, the second at the same place in 1864. While the United States has shown many signs of friendship for the Latin American countries, on her war with Mexico, which Lincoln denounced in Congress and Grant declared "an unholy war," suspicion was aroused throughout Latin America and to all appearances it looked as though the United States were following the policy of European monarchies. The Spanish-American War did not help matters. The seizing of Panama rather added to the suspicion until the United States paid to Columbia $25,000,000. Then the United States going to the aid of the European Entante and taking no land greatly helped to remove suspicion, giving a new attitude of friendliness to the United States. The Monroe Doctrine has not been always understood and frequently has been dreadfully abused by North American jingoes. The Pan American conferences have helped to a larger understanding of conditions and attitudes.

The countries of the Caribbean sea present grave problems. The United States must tie up commercially with all Latin America and maintain a high idealism in her dealings lest there be a growing fear that the United States will use her financial and military power to oppress weaker peoples. It is the greatest international question facing North America. There must be a friendly reciprocity with Mexico and a just and satisfactory relation with the Caribbean countries; likewise an improved diplomacy. True American solidarity is dependent upon a real understanding between the various nations. This is being helped by the exchange of professors and students, a good literature, and Christian missionaries, who are the spiritual ambassadors. Dr. Inman covers more than 400 pages in a most informing and convincing argument for a better understanding as the only pathway to American solidarity. He has not been afraid to point out the wrongs of both and at the same time to show the way to the correction of the wrongs. He writes out of a wide experience and his utterances make for a closer friendship between the United States and Latin American countries.

In *Facing the Crisis*, by Sherwood Eddy, (Doran), a clear and ringing answer is given to some of the urgent questions of the hour. The lectures which make up the book have come forth out of the author's experience in dealing with students in all parts of the world. Every-

where in his travels he met the same round of questions about the great verities of faith and about the great problems of the world. What are we to believe? What are we to do? These are the questions which lie back of the book. In the first part the author sums up in a clear and assuring manner the meaning and grounds of a vital modern faith in Christ, God, the Bible, immortality, the reconciliation of religion and science, the new birth, and the new life. In the latter part of the book the author deals with the challenging problem of the world's crisis. It is here, especially, that he speaks like a prophet, and proves himself to be a man with a message. The crisis as he sees it is not single but manifold. There is the crisis in national and international relations which seems to become increasingly grave. Is war finally to destroy all civilization, or is war to be outlawed and destroyed? It is one thing or the other. There is the crisis in the world's industrial life—unrest and strikes in every country—three thousand strikes in one year in America alone. What is the meaning of it all? Is there a remedy? There is the crisis in race relations, in Asia, in Europe, in Africa, and in America. There is the crisis in religion. The revelations and reactions of the war; theological controversy; more rapid progress in worldly things than in spiritual things. The book is a plea that we face the crisis fearlessly and humbly, and meet it with Christ's own gospel.

Of books for children we do not hesitate to say that *The Children's Bible* being selections from the Old and New Testaments, translated and arranged by Henry A. Sherman, head of the department of religious literature of Charles Scribner's Sons, and Charles Foster Kent, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University (Scribner's), must be named first. This book should be wherever there is a child. It sweeps through the entire Bible from "The Story of Creation" to "The New Heaven on Earth," and is an achievement of great worth. It has preserved the beauty of the King James Version and has about it that simplicity that gives it a perpetual charm to the child mind. It is a work of highest merit and for years to come we will go back to it as an epoch in the study of the Bible.

A present day discussion of Christian faith and practice is well presented by Dr. Richard Roberts in a book of 131 pages under the title *What's Best Worth Saying* (Doran). It consists of ten chapters, all of them an appeal for spiritual freedom, which, however, he names as the title of one chapter and interprets it as the condition a man achieves when he turns and says to his bound mind, "Go forth; to his bound heart, Go forth; and to his bound moral sense, Go forth; and to his bound will, Go forth." Such is our redemption that carries with it the joy of creation, of discovery, and of service. Every chapter is thoughtful; especially helpful are the eighth, ninth and tenth. All are right in ventures and spiritual aspects of a holy search.

No one can read one of the sermons in *The Undiscovered Country,* by Dr. Gaius Glenn Atkins (Revell), without being fascinated by the exquisite grace of diction. Many of his sentences are lines of poetry. His spiritual interpretations have in them the experience of reality. There are eleven sermons in the volume entitled "The Undiscovered Country," "Highways in the Heart," "The Road We Travel But Once," "The Shared Morsel," "The Blessing of the Dew," "The Wings of the Morning," "The Worth of a Man," "Lost Rivers," "The Power of the Upward Look," "The Other Worldly Church," and "The Ultimate God." He says in the closing sermon, "There is a great need amongst us of a new quietism, not a mystic discipline possible only for an elect few, but a new waiting upon truth made possible only by a more tranquil and open spirit."

That man, animals and plants all originate from a one-celled ovum (egg or seed) is argued in a little volume of just one hundred pages by Dr. William W. Keen, emeritus professor of surgery in Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia. The title of the book, which has been enlarged from the commencement address of last June at Crozer Theological Seminary, is *I Believe in God and in Evolution* (Lippincott). Passing from the remarkable presence of a human ovum, Dr. Keen says, "From a single cell when fertilized, there develop myriads and myriads of cells. These cells quickly begin to differentiate into the various tissues and organs of the body: bone, muscle, nerve, heart, liver, kidney; or into those still more wonderfully complex organs, the eye, the ear, and the brain. Moreover, the later exact color of the eyes, of the skin—white, black, brown etc.—along with other racial qualities of body and mind, straight or curly hair, Grecian, Roman, Jewish, Negro nose, the oblique, Asiatic eyes, the longer arms and projecting heel of the Negro, the high cheek bone of the American Indian. There are always symmetrical pairs of eyes, ears, nostrils, arms, legs, brain (in right and left hemispheres), lungs, kidneys, ribs, etc., but only one liver, stomach, pancreas, spleen, etc. 'Why, in the embryo, should the little bud which is to become a human arm always develop at exactly the right place and not grow out on the front of the chest or on the back nearer the spine? . . . Why should the two arms (and the two legs) always grow to virtually the same length? Why should the human body grow for about twenty years and then stop growing?' The only answer is that in that tiny primordial cell were enshrined all the orderly sequences and potencies of human development."

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CB

OL. XII NO. 4

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

APRIL, 1923

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions.* It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XII. **APRIL, 1923** **No. 4**

CONTENTS

UNITY, NOT UNIFORMITY 249
By Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Principal New College, University of London.

REPLY BY THE MOST REV. NIKOLAOS, METROPOLITAN OF NUBIA, TO DR. LHAMON 254
(Translated by Ralph W. Brown.)

UNITY—ITS METHODS AND OBJECTIONS 261
By Rev. George Woolsey Hodge, D.D., Former Secretary Church Unity Society (Episcopal), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

UNITY AT WORK IN PORTO RICO 280
By Rev. J. D. Montgomery, Bayamón, Porto Rico.

A CHRISTIAN UNITY OFFICE BUILDING IN MEMORY OF PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D. 292
By Rev. Rufus W. Miller, D.D., Secretary Philip Schaff Memorial Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY . 300

BOOK REVIEWS 315

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR JANUARY, 1923

COÖPERATION THE ROAD TO UNITY 169
By Rev. A. W. Fortune, Ph.D., Pastor Central Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky.

UNITY—ITS IDEAL AND NECESSITY 180
By Rev. George Woolsey Hodge, D.D., Former Secretary Church Unity Society (Episcopal), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

CONSOLIDATION 199
By Rev. William C. Clark, Pastor Congregational Church, Bakersfield, Vermont.

THE MORAL TEST FOR FUTURE LIFE 217
By Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., Pastor Crowstone Congregational Church, Westcliff-on-Sea, England.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 224

BOOK REVIEWS 239

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

MEETING of the World Conference Committee on Faith and Order, Kew Gardens, N. Y., April 3-5, 1923, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Washington, D. C., 1925. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1923 or 1924. Archbishop of Uppsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople and Rev. Dr. A. J. Brown, chairmen; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity. Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

A CHALLENGE TO PRAYER

Fellowship of Prayer.

There is no fellowship comparable to that of those whose faces are set toward the City of God. No greater thing is seen or done or suffered than by those who share the toil and the travail, the romance and the grandeur of the great adventure of finding God. We have to reacquire the practice of fellowship in prayer before there will be any new life in the church or in the world. There is water in the well, but we have not wherewith to draw; there is grain in the granaries, but we have lost the key. The same market place is open, and its milk and wine sold without measure or reserve to those who bring the coin of Faith and Love.

Lord, teach us to pray.

Fellowship of Service.

He that loveth his brother abideth in the light and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. . . . Hereby we know we love, because He laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

Lord and Saviour of those who are poor, strip from us ruthlessly all earthly treasure. If Thou givest us money, teach us to hold it lightly—as knowing that it is not our own. Teach us also to give it gladly—as knowing that we are debtors unto our brethren. Give us a high and invincible poverty of spirit, content with a bare sufficiency of worldly goods, restless and ill at ease if more is given, until it be lost again in sharing with our brethren.

And as they thus spake, Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them.

—*The Challenge, London.*

A PRAYER

O Lord our God, Who hast sought us, Who hast called us, and Who hast commanded us to shine with Thy light into the darkness of the world, accept our approaches unto Thee and grant us such earnest of the Spirit that we may show forth humility of attitude and brotherly affection toward Thy whole church. Destroy in us the thought that any one of us is better than another because of our theological interpretation, but remember, O Lord, Thy whole church and pour upon every Christian the riches of Thy grace, that we may be steadfast in walking before Thee in justice and mercy. Amen.

None Free from the Guilt of Schism

All ecclesiastical organisations are but fragments of the Church of Christ, and none of them is altogether free from the guilt of schism. One thing we can all do, and that is to cultivate a catholic spirit; one duty is incumbent upon every Church, and that is to exhibit in its own life, and as far as possible in common with other Churches, such a spirit of true brotherhood as will convince the world of the Saviour's divine mission and prove the Church to be a divine institution. When such evidence is forthcoming, no amount of variety in the forms and aspects of the Church will be a real stumbling-block to faith. Without such a practical manifestation of the Spirit of Christ, no ecclesiastical union, however elaborate and complete, will ever establish His claim to the universal homage of mankind.

—*James Alexander M'Clymont,*
Moderator of the Church of Scotland.

The Christian Union Quarterly

With this issue *The Christian Union Quarterly* closes its twelfth volume. We are grateful for the discovery through these years of those who are interested in the healing of the divisions of the church and whose interest and support have made possible the continuance of this medium of communication between all communions in all countries. We are bold to affirm that it marks encouraging progress toward the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord, however distant the unity of Christendom may be.

On the opening of the thirteenth volume, which will be the July issue, we are planning to increase the size and at the same time to widen the field for the reception of such articles in Christian thought and life as have to do with better understanding among the divisions of Christendom.

The editorial board will be enlarged.

The subscription price will be increased to $2.50 per year, 75 cents per single copy.

The Editor.

UNITY, NOT UNIFORMITY

In the interest of the movement, to the advocacy of which The Christian Union Quarterly is devoted, it seems necessary that a reply should be offered to two articles in the October issue—Mr. Grubb's "Christian Reunion from the Quaker Point of View," and Dr. Hall's "Some Thoughts on Unity—a Statement," with special reference to a third article, "Church Unity, Being the Report of a Joint Conference Held Recently at Lambeth Palace." Throughout Mr. Grubb's article there is an assumption that those who are concerned in this movement are ignorant of the considerations that he advances. We recognize that there must be unity of spirit, if there is to be any "visible" reunion that is worth having; and it is because we are convinced that the Spirit of God has been drawing Christians into this unity, that we are trying to see how far those causes of division in the organization of the Church may be removed so that the unity of spirit may be made "visible" even in the organization.

Those who are engaged in this movement belong to Christian communions who, unlike the Society of Friends, have retained the sacraments, and the ministry, which the Christian Church has had from the beginning as elements in its visible organization, and who hold that it is the duty of the Christian Church to confess its faith in such terms as shall make it intelligible to men, although they have differed as to the form in which that confession shall be made, some requiring acceptance of a creed as a condition of ministry and membership, others refusing any such test, yet reserving the right of a corporate confession from time to time. Mr. Grubb quite arbitrarily has chosen the First Epistle of John as defining what Christianity is, and what accordingly the Christian Churches should be, in order that he may con-

demn the movement toward reunion for concerning itself with these questions of sacraments and ministry. Just as reasonably might the Epistle of James be taken as a proof that Christianity does not include a doctrine of atonement for sin as an interpretation of the death of Christ. We must not thus pick and choose among the writings of the New Testament that which serves our own sectarian purpose, but must take the whole New Testament. There, while inspiration is primary, organization is not depreciated. The Society of Friends may or may not be right in setting aside, as among Christian communions it alone as far as I can remember has done, the sacraments and the ministry, and the ideal and actuality of the church as there presented; but Mr. Grubb is not entitled to ignore the rest of the New Testament, and all it contains, which, in the judgment of most Christians, does not justify the Quaker position. It is a somewhat arrogant proceeding, although Mr. Grubb certainly does not mean to be arrogant, to forbid all attempts at Christian reunion until all communions have come to the Quaker standpoint. Those who have preserved continuity with the apostolic church as a historical institution in respect of sacraments, ministry, etc., have a right to consider how the divisions, which in these respects have obscured the unity of spirit, may be removed, so that that unity may again be made visible. The communions that do attach importance to these matters, and are convinced that the New Testament warrants their attaching that importance, cannot approach the question of Christian reunion in any other way, having assured themselves that it is the Spirit of God which is prompting them to make this effort, and will lead them aright. Mr. Grubb must not assume that he is a more spiritual Christian because he attaches little, if any, importance to organization.

There is in this movement in its present phase no exclusion from the Christian Church. Mr. Grubb is not

entitled to quote the statement in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, in which baptism is insisted on, as though Nonconformity had accepted that condition, (pp. 133-134), for in the report of the subsequent Conference he will find this definition of the membership of the Christian Church: "This one church consists of all those who have been or are being redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form" (p. 109). I do not know how a more comprehensive or a less exclusive definition could be given. The sacraments and the ministry are not insisted on as *essential* to this one church, but as "visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men," and as having "been since the days of the apostles." Those who refuse or reject these marks are not excluded from the church; but obviously they have not any interest in the discussion of how differences in regard to these marks may be adjusted in order to bring together the communions which both have the marks and attach importance to them. Must those who take this standpoint make no attempt to adjust their differences until they have all with Mr. Grubb become convinced that they are of no importance? Is the standing of the Society of Friends within the one Christian Church more assured by the continuance of these differences between Anglicans and Nonconformists? Is there any suggestion anywhere that (suppose the reunion did take place), the attitude of that wider fellowship would be less tolerant than are any of the communions which would enter into it? It is because the intolerance of the past, which Mr. Grubb conjures up as a bogey to frighten us, is fast decaying, that it is now possible for Anglicans and Nonconformists to confer together, and to reach that measure of agreement which the report discloses; and there is nothing in that report from beginning to end which gives ground for fearing any revival of that intolerance.

"All the worst divisions in the church," says Mr. Grubb, "turn precisely on these external matters of verbal definition and rigid order" (p. 132). What is said in the report shows how groundless such a fear as regards the future is. If the section on *The Place of the Creed in a United Church* is carefully studied, it will be seen that it fully provides for "reasonable liberty of interpretation," the supreme authority of the Scriptures, "the continued presence and teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body," and recognizes that the creeds are not to be regarded as "a complete expression of the Christian faith" (p. 114). As a Congregationalist, I have been and still am opposed to any creed subscription as an imposition on the individual conscience, or limitation of the freedom of the Spirit of God in such conscience; and I am fully persuaded, as one who has some personal responsibility in the drafting of this section, that all these legitimate interests are properly guarded, while provision is made for the church's confession of the intellectual contents of its faith to the world in continuity with the testimony of the church in previous generations. Again, no "rigid order" is demanded. The acceptance of the episcopate does not exclude but includes the recognition that other types should have a place in the polity, and "should be maintained with a representative and constitutional episcopate." What this in detail involves is still a matter of conference. Nearly all that Mr. Grubb derives from the experience of the past has no relevancy whatever to the present situation. It would be a pity if the Society of Friends, on so inadequate grounds, set itself in opposition to so world-wide a movement of, as I firmly believe, the Spirit of God.

I am not going to attempt to deal in detail with Dr. Hall's statement; but it is quite evident from it that he does not think of reunion in any real sense of the word, but of the reabsorption of all other communions into the

communion which alone claims to be Catholic. "The point involved is simply this, that the full covenant arrangements of Christ ought to be recognized and gladly accepted by all. To this end it is imperative to Catholic minds that no compromise between the ancient faith and order of Christ's church and later systems shall be made" (p. 125). This is the tone of Rome rather than of Canterbury, and Rome would not allow that Canterbury had any right to speak in any such tone; for in Rome Anglicanism is not Catholic. There is the assumption that the ancient faith and order, as the Catholic holds it, has the personal authority of Christ. Modern historical scholarship, as represented even by Anglican scholars, does not warrant any such assumption. Not to go back to Lightfoot and Hort, the volume of "Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry of Various Writers," edited by H. B. Sweet, D.D. (Macmillan and Co., 1918), does not support such a contention. That man assumes a responsibility, which I for one would not be prepared to assume, who, on so slender a basis of historical conjecture as such enquiries may leave—although in my judgment they do not even do that —asserts so arrogant a claim which bars the way at the outset to all enquiry and conference regarding Christian reunion. Fortunately Dr. Hall does not speak for Anglicanism, but only for a section of it, and not even all of those who belong to that section. Otherwise the conferences between Anglicans and Nonconformists would never have taken place, and would never have issued in the report, which shows at least that there are both "Catholics" and "Protestants" who under the guidance of God's Spirit are prepared to correct their divisive errors and to follow the unifying truth. With them, and not with Mr. Grubb on the one hand, or Dr. Hall on the other, lies the hope for Christian reunion.

Alfred E. Garvie.

New College, London.

REPLY BY THE MOST REV. NIKOLAOS, METROPOLITAN OF NUBIA, TO DR. LHAMON

(Translated by Ralph W. Brown*)

A copy has just been sent to me of the issue for April, 1922, of the excellent periodical The Christian Union Quarterly, published at Baltimore, U. S. A., containing (pp. 316-317) a review and brief criticism of our Memorial concerning the preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order in Geneva and the union of the churches. Our Memorial was translated into English by the general secretary of the Geneva meeting and published in The Christian Union Quarterly, January, 1922, pp. 194-215.

The critique by Dr. W. J. Lhamon, entitled "Ancient Orthodoxy in Relation to the Modern Mind," must not pass unchallenged, not only because it places a wrong construction upon certain important points of our Memorial, but because the essay is accompanied by an expression of opinion on the part of this well-known theologian as to the Nicene Creed and the dogmatic decisions of the seven Ecumenical Councils.

After praising our article and our deep and genuine yearning for union, Dr. Lhamon takes up the central idea of the Memorial, viz., the basis upon which, in our opinion, any effort for union ought to rest. Dr. Lhamon finds an unbridgeable chasm between ancient Orthodoxy and the modern demands of the modern mind. He adds, "He (the Metropolitan) insists that union must come on the orthodox basis of the Ancient Eastern Church, the dogmas of the Nicene Fathers and of the Seven Ecumenical Synods, not realizing how foreign all this is to the modern mind, or even to his own definition of a

*From *Pantainos,* Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Alexandria, Egypt, Dec. 23, 1922. There has been no opportunity to submit this translation to the Metropolitan.

Christian, which is as follows: 'A Christian, according to the mind of the church and of religion, has the name of a believer in Christ, and does believe in Christ as by nature the Son of God, and acknowledges Him as leader of his religious and moral life. A man is not a Christian who acts according to the law of the Gospel but who does not believe in the law-giver and in God, for the doctrine and work of Christ is indissolubly bound up with His Person.' How readily the Christian of to-day, the man of Christ with a modern mind, assents to every word of this!"

Farther on, Dr. Lhamon contrasts with this our words, "The holy Nicene Creed and the dogmatic decrees of the seven great Ecumenical Synods form a divine basis, infallible and of indisputable validity. By those synods the Church of Christ, then one and united, spoke the final word on questions of faith. Any change of those doctrines constitutes not progress and completion, but perversion of the substance of the faith, pernicious and perilous innovation." Dr. Lhamon characterizes those views as a retrogression in the faith.

We perceive no contradiction or opposition for the modern mind between the above definition of a Christian and the Nicene Creed or the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, because we hold that the Holy Fathers expounded the various problems of the faith clearly and infallibily, after great research, not only for their age but for every age, and were guided by the Holy Spirit, and their doctrine cannot be gainsaid to-day. And since the same causes always produce the same effects, and since good logic does not vary, if the modern mind thinks correctly and is devout in theory and practice, like those inspired fathers and teachers of the world, it will not form strange doctrines contrary to those of olden times.

The Christian of to-day, the man of Christ with the modern mind, as our critic calls him, does not prejudice

or bind his free conscience and judgment in any way, if he holds to sacred tradition *(quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus creditum est)* as his precious aid and unfailing guide in the search of Holy Scripture, "in which," as St. Peter says, "are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction" (II Peter 3:16). Just as a Christian is not considered to be deprived of moral liberty because he conforms to the moral law and follows the path of virtue, by the help of God and the grace of the Holy Spirit, so also he who searches into the deep thoughts of Holy Scripture is not limited, but helped, by the results of ancient research and ancient learning.

Nor is it a retrogression on the part of the Christian of to-day to believe in the Nicene Creed as a divine basis, secure and of unquestionable validity, because, as is well known, the Nicene Creed is constructed strictly of words and phrases of the Gospels, to serve as a ready guide, as an orthodox confession of faith, and as a means of identifying the faithful. We hold to tradition according to the words of St. Paul: "Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle" (II Thess. 2:15). We are convinced that divine truths are not subject to change or variation, or to the influence of place and time. Just as Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, so too His teaching admits of one sole right interpretation. "Adherence to that position," says our critic, "bars all possible union with Christians who really live this side of Copernicus." We are confident that the writer of those words, which we regret, does not express the mind of the Anglican Church,* as appears from many indications, official and unofficial, on the part of the Lambeth Conference (the

*Dr. Lhamon has occupied the Bible Chair for many years in Drury College, Springfield, Mo.

creed commonly called Nicene would be accepted by the united church "as the sufficient statement of the corporate faith. * * The use of the creeds liturgically in the public worship of the church should be regarded as an expression of corporate faith and allegiance."—See the Report of Conferences at Lambeth Palace [1922],—The Place of the Creed in a United Church, III, 4 and 6). The same appears in the theological discussions (1918) between the former Metropolitan of Athens, Meletios, and those who accompanied him, with various leading members of the hierarchy and theologians of the Anglican communion in America and England.

We assure our critic that the Baconian and inductive methods, which he invokes, do not contribute as much to a right understanding of metaphysical truths and the mysteries of religion as does the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers and their successors, who had the Apostles' proclamation in their very ears. The microscope and telescope, of which our critic boasts, are the property of all mankind, which respects geology and botany and astronomy, and follows them as Americans do, but finds that all these things, which contribute so much to the development of the human mind and to the comprehension of the human element in Holy Scripture, are of no great help in exploring the truths of the faith received by revelation.

Dr. Lhamon says that the Nicene Creed and the dogmas of the Greek and Roman Fathers functioned for their times; our own teachings must function for our times.

In discussing the basis for the union of the churches, we must not forget that we have to agree upon a common basis, one that does not admit of misinterpretation and change, and which at the same time shall be distinctive evidence of doctrinal agreement.

There have been creeds and doctrinal summaries of

the Christian faith ever since apostolic times, as is clear from St. Paul's expressions, "form of doctrine, that which is committed to (thy) trust, form of sound words." These words too are regarded as a creed: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory" (I Tim. 3:16). The Nicene Creed was composed from these and other early statements of the faith, for historical reasons, and has prevailed throughout the ages. We prefer it to any other creedal statement because all the elements of reverence and truth are centered in it; because there is no need for us to alter the form of the faith from time to time, as the style of clothing changes; because this creed was formulated by wise Fathers of the East and West, by holy men who still bore the stigmata of the Lord in their bodies from the recent persecutions; because it sets forth clearly the salutary truths of religion; because it is bound up with the holy sacraments of Baptism, the Holy Eucharist and Holy Orders; because the indissolubility and oneness of the orthodox faith is manifested by it without regard to time and place, nation and language.

Dr. Lhamon holds that by searching the Gospels one can attain a clearer and broader idea of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost without the limitations of the Nicene Creed.

To be sure, the farther one ascends toward the springs, the purer water does he find. But we say that in the Nicene Creed there is no limitation or circumscription, but simply words and phrases of the very Gospel. It came about not to trammel scientific theologians in studying the Gospel, but to make it easier for the faithful. However, in seeking truth at its very source, we cannot apply the extreme liberal principle, nor test the

Gospel by the same means as other philological compositions. What that method leads to is shown by the hundreds of Protestant religious systems, and by the rationalistic groups, which latter finally deny the inspiration of Holy Scripture and miracle. As against them, we have two great ancient churches which endure precisely because they are firmly set upon the ancient bases, because as churches they rest their doctrine upon the fundamental bases of the faith. Some persons regard "liberty" and its results as scientific life and movement, and find fault with the Eastern and Western church for stagnation, but we hold that the lack of authority leads to utter laxity in religion and to its disintegration.

Our critic holds (especially with regard to the Triune God) that "Definitions are limitations, and to limit the infinite is a contradiction in terms." Evidently this opinion is based on Spinoza's principle, *omnis determinatio est negatio.* Of course every definition does mark an intellectual boundary which excludes the contrary. God, as illimitable, cannot be conceived at the same time as limited. But one must not suppose from this that in defining God as Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, the Son as eternally generated, and the Holy Ghost as eternally proceeding, we limit God in His reality. These definitions do not express a shortcoming or a lack or limitation. This logical definition, inasmuch as it is a denial of imperfection or denial of its own opposite, is real perfection.

But for these measures of assistance which the church supplies without hampering the study of the Holy Scriptures, the Christian is in danger of going astray into wrong doctrines. The Lord and His disciples taught only those things which the feeble intellect of man can understand. When the human mind is tempted to form a broader idea of God, et cetera, than that which the whole church has formed on the basis of what has been

handed down by the original witnesses and servants of the word, it is in danger of falling into pantheism or rationalism. All the sciences have their own laws and principles, beyond which there is an *impasse* and chaos. Christianity too, as a revealed religion, has mysteries incomprehensible for the human mind. But Christianity is preëminently the historical fact which began at Bethlehem and Jerusalem, but which has developed, and which possesses its own history, a history that the "modern mind" cannot ignore.

†Nikolaos,
(Metropolitan) of Nubia.

Khartum, Sudan.

OUR THINKING

To THINK alone will save our souls, and save
Society, while not to think is sin,
And damns your fellow man as sure as fate.
The most atrocious crimes in history
Were perpetrated by "good" men, cock-sure
That they obeyed divine injunctions, laws
Laid down by fiat, which 't were sacrilege
To question. Bloody Marys, Torquemads,
The whole vile crew Inquisitorial,
Were pious to a turn, were sure they served
A holy God while butchering fellow men.
They stubbornly refused to think, or raise
A question of the right or wrong of deeds
That shook high heaven and made of earth a hell.
A race of thinkers is the only hope
Of progress, justice, peace, security.
A code of laws contrived to stifle thought,
And rob men of their freedom to speak out
What they may think, is wicked, monstrous, rank,
Unutterable crime, the measureless,
Unpardonable sin against mankind.
To think is universal human right,
The indefeasible inheritance
Of every human soul. Nor that alone.
To think is duty, highest, first, and last.

—*Joseph Ernest McAfee.*

UNITY—ITS METHODS AND OBJECTIONS

If the ideal and necessity of unity as set forth in my former article could come to be generally accepted, and there were a sincere desire to secure unity, what steps should be taken to bring it about?

In the first place there would have to be conferences between authoritative representatives of the various bodies willing so to unite. Then agreement would have to be reached as to the exact terms on which such union was to be based, some such terms, for instance, as those laid down in the Chicago-Lambeth platform. Only, it would have to be made clear that all existing bodies were to be allowed to continue their present organizations, pastors, teachings, and modes of worship, until gradually a complete amalgamation into one body could be effected, and that any reception of the historic episcopate would not be considered as involving the imposition of a theory in regard to its character or necessity, but simply its acceptance as a fact necessary to secure and act as a bond of unity.

If these principles could be agreed upon, then a regular convention of duly appointed delegates from each Christian body willing to enter into this agreement would have to be assembled. These delegations should be based not on the numerical strength of the bodies they represent, as that might give to one undue prominence over another, but each should be entitled to an equal representation, as the several States of the Union are in the United States Senate. And any question arising should be decided not by a mere majority of those voting, but by at least a two-thirds vote of all. And each body could still reserve to itself the right to come into the union, or not, as it might see best.

This convention should draw up a constitution describ-

ing the character and essential principles of the church and prescribe its system of government, councils, and officers, with their respective powers and duties, and all the other fundamental things that are usually laid down in the constitutions of the various religious bodies. To this might be added from time to time such a body of laws for the government of the church as might be required. Then the great task should be undertaken of districting the whole of the national territory into dioceses, synods, or provinces as the extent of the population might require, and of subdividing these again into parishes, so that there might once more be a real and effective parochial system, which is the most ideal and successful way of providing for the spiritual and social needs of all the people, those living in a given neighborhood, forming an united family under a pastor, or pastors, who could know and look after the needs of all, and each contributing his or her share to the support and carrying on of the work of the church at large. This constitution of the church should provide for the election of the rulers and clergy of the church and their ordination to their several offices in such modes as should describe their respective characters. Enabling acts of legislatures should be obtained to permit the transfer of property from existing trustees to others representing the union, preferably to those of a diocese or synod rather than of a parish or congregation. Experience has proved that there has been so much unwise or improper use of funds by individual congregations, and their tendency is so much to look after their own interests rather than those of the whole church or community, that it is not expedient to leave such in their hands. And it is only thus that the independence of the clergy and a suitable provision for their support could be secured, apart from the ability, or willingness, of a particular congregation to give for this purpose, and the

needs of a neighborhood met, without consideration of its financial ability.

Then the whole tremendous work of reconstruction could be undertaken, the general assembly of the whole church and the intermediary councils down to the parochial organizations being given the power to make the necessary changes, supernumerary churches and institutions could be weeded out and their property disposed of, and used to erect and equip or support those really needed in a given district. Where there are now perhaps seven or more insignificant buildings without proper equipment or provision, producing no substantial effect in a commnuity, one large church, by its proportions and character worthy of its purpose, could be erected to be a witness and memorial to the imperative necessity and sublime uses of religion and, by its staff of clergymen and workers, its schools and appliances for providing for the individual and social welfare of all within its reach, become an enormous influence for the uplift and benefit of the district. Such single churches could easily be adapted for the use of all the various peoples thus called into the unity of the one Body. Its chancel could be fitted for the purposes of a sacramental and ritualistic worship, and its nave, from which it could be separated at certain times by folding doors or curtains, could be used, as were the naves of the great churches of the old world in medieval times for all sorts of purposes, for simple preaching or evangelistic services, or for public meetings, for discussions, exhibition of pictures, lectures, etc. The amount of church property which is at present not at all adequately employed reaches up into the millions. And men are asking on all sides, why this waste? What is the necessity for all these different buildings in the same locality, many of which are not even open except for a few hours one day in each week and attended frequently by a mere handful

of people? On all principles of justice and expediency this vast financial capital should be put to better use; more results should be obtained from it. But that can only be done by an united church.

In many places where there are already large and substantial church edifices and where the numbers of the people attending them could justify it, several of them might be retained, one being used for one kind of worship, and one for another, or one perhaps being utilized as a parish building, or school, or public hall. But in every case all the ecclesiastical property of a village or neighborhood should be pooled, as it were, and employed to the fullest extent and for the good of all. Many of the present institutions of the different churches could be amalgamated; the various missionary societies merged into one or brought to work in harmony with each other, without the overlapping or neglecting of any home districts or foreign fields. An immense saving in office expenses would be secured. The colleges, and especially the various denominational theological seminaries, of which there are now too many, most of which are but partially endowed, and unable to provide the fullest educational advantages for their students, could be consolidated in a few powerful and well equipped institutions. The church could once more control the education of the people, contributing that religious element which is essential to all true education, and which is impossible because of the present rivalries and divisions of Christians. If it became no longer a question of sectarian teaching, but simply of Christian or non-Christian education, the latter could be freely given in our public schools, with permission for the children of Jews or of atheists or agnostics to be exempted.

So the church could assume again that provision for the social welfare of the people which for centuries was her exclusive province, and which needs her religious

atmosphere and influence to save it from the inevitable abuses of mere officialism and secularity.

Of course there would be difficult and delicate questions to decide in effecting all these reforms, but if there should be the right spirit and desire on the part of all to promote the true interests of the church and enable it to perform efficiently its glorious work for the benefit of all, perfecting our Christian civilization, there ought to be no insurmountable obstacle to its accomplishment.

If in the drawing up of these constitutions and in forming these unions, the desire on the part of all was to embody in them that which was good or efficient in any existing system, the antagonisms and desire of one party to triumph over another could be avoided. If there is value in an episcopate as an executive, or in one that is historic for preserving continuity and unity, it should be secured. If the characteristics of Presbyterianism in standing for the equality of ministers, and its government by councils are good and useful, they should be incorporated in the new system. If the independence of individual congregations, which Congregationalism maintains is advisable, should be desired, that too should be provided for, and these things are not incompatible. They have been all more or less the characteristics of the Christian Church and when properly adjusted have worked together harmoniously. It is only when one of these traits has been exaggerated and carried to an extreme, to the loss of the others, that harm and division have been caused. At times the episcopate has become autocratic and tyrannical. Presbyterianism has felt the want of an executive, independency of a cohesive influence. Each of these tendencies would be met in an organization into which these several elements enter, so combining the varying systems together as to gain the advantages possessed by each without its defects.

So in regard to all provisions as to the doctrinal basis

of the church, the effort should be to discriminate between what must be regarded as *de fide,* essential to the profession of the Christian faith, and what may be regarded as open questions or matters of pious belief. Here there is so substantial an agreement among the great mass of Christians of very varying names, that it ought not to be difficult to find such a basis, if the test of general consent is adopted as the determining method, nothing which has not that authority being required as a term of membership.

The question as to forms should be simpler still, only those things universally conceded to have been ordained by Christ Himself, or accepted by all Christian bodies, and what is absolutely necessary to their integrity, being insisted upon. All forms or methods of worship which may seem to be edifying to any, even though to some they may appear to be founded on false assumptions, should be freely allowed, provided always their use be not forced upon those who do not believe in nor desire them.

Some great existing organizations, like the Methodist body, which has proved its power of expansion and ability to get hold of and arouse the enthusiasm of the masses as no other body does, might be incorporated almost without change into the united church, if its authorities could return to the position intended for it by its founders, of acting as an auxiliary to, instead of a substitute for, the historic church. There is nothing in its teachings or formularies inconsistent with its occupying that position. The Methodists simply drifted away from the Church of England through circumstances which seemed to necessitate or justify their doing so. Those circumstances no longer exist. Why should not the exercise of charity and a spirit of love and conciliation and the manifest expediency of the thing, bring together this great body and the churches of the Anglican

Communion with which it is historically so closely allied? Whatever may have been the causes of the original separation, are there any which really justify it to-day?

If the Friends and the Salvation Army, who discard a regular ministry or the use of sacraments, could be brought so to widen their sympathies as to be willing to work harmoniously with those who feel the need of these things, the glory of their Christian testimony and the power of their organizations would be immeasurably enhanced.

The methods of adjusting the financial concerns of the united church would depend upon varying circumstances and conditions. Where property is held absolutely by parishes or societies, it could of course be disposed of at will by the votes of the trustees or the congregation, as the case might be. Where it is invested funds for the benefit of a particular denomination, or some object connected therewith, the courts would have to be satisfied that it was the will of the denomination to be merged into the greater body, in which case it would naturally carry its property with it. In cases where there are specific trusts, which could no longer be executed, then the courts would, by a well-known principle, permit their use for purposes analogous to those originally specified as possible. There might be instances in which even that could not be done, and there would be loss. There would also be cases in which a small minority of a body would not approve of the action of the majority, and would claim title to all its property, as representing the original donors. Here again the courts would have to decide on the justice of the claim, or the amount they would be entitled to receive. There is no question but that these adjustments could be made, or if any loss should occur it would be far more than counterbalanced by the financial gain which would result from union.

Of course manifold objections will be brought against

this plan of union. Some regard all possibility of such a thing as absolutely chimerical. A distinguished layman thirty-odd years ago described it as "an iridescent dream" and discouraged all efforts to promote it in any way. These persons consider that the differences of opinion and view among Christians are so great and have continued so long, that it is simply hopeless to imagine that they can ever be harmonized. But to think so is surely to disbelieve in the power of the Christian religion eventually so to possess and rule men's hearts that they must come to dwell and work together in love and unity. As we have insisted, divisions are due to human sins and human weakness, and the true Christian and the whole Christian body must outgrow those things. Both the moral and intellectual progress of the world are advancing so rapidly and spreading so widely, that men generally are becoming more and more able to discriminate between what is essential and non-essential, and to be governed in the conclusions they reach more by love and a sound mind than by unreasoning prejudice, as has been so largely the case in the past. The inability to understand and appreciate and do justice to the position of others is becoming less and less the characteristic of the educated and cultivated man.

And if a thing be morally right and should be done, surely if it be approached in the right temper a method must be formed to accomplish it, no matter what obstacles are in the way. And there is more humility in discussing this subject now than formerly, not so much of that disposition to insist that all the truth is on the one side and all the wrong on the other, and to believe that those who differ from us must necessarily have evil motives or narrow intellects. Everywhere men are realizing that there are two sides to every question, that the same thing may be looked at from different angles, and that both views may be true. Many are coming to

recognize that most of the divisions of Christendom have been caused either by the neglect of some truth or the overlooking of it, or through emphasizing one to the exclusion of others, and that the true way to arrive at a right result is to find out the truth which each teaches, or each body stands for, and incorporate all into an harmonious whole. This course if persevered in will certainly lead to unity in the end.

Doubtless for a long time to come there will be those who will be incapable of acquiring this temper and judicial mind. There will be standpatters, unwilling to move or yield an inch, who will continue to hold to what they believe to be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and look upon any who differ from them, even in the smallest and most insignificant points, as in the wrong, and feel that they can enter into no agreement nor union with such. There will be those who will feel that any departure from what they consider orthodox doctrine, necessarily excludes from all possibility of Christian communion. Others hold so strongly to a certain type of ecclesiastical government that they regard all not embracing it as outside the lines of the Catholic church, must be received in just such a sense as they conritual that they could not tolerate any departure from them, and some things may be regarded by others with such aversion and as so objectionable that they could not assume the responsibility of seeming to sanction them in any way.

These attitudes of mind, however, are becoming rare. One does not hear to-day the same denunciation of heretics as formerly. Excommunication has become unknown, trials for heresy are coming to be generally avoided when possible, and even controversy is growing less, or is condutced on much more kindly and Christian principles, with the view of learning what is the truth, rather than to gain the victory over an adversary. It is

coming more and more to be felt that questions of belief are matters for each man's conscience to decide for himself, and that in religion, as in science, it is by learning what others have to teach, that a general consent as to conclusions comes about. So there is much less effort to enforce uniformity, and more readiness to recognize that men can worship and be edified by different forms. There is also much less disposition to denounce and ridicule ritual acts as superstition or "mummery," as was formerly so frequently done. All these things indicate that it will not be so impossible for Christians of different minds, gradually at least, to approach one another.

But there are many who urge strong arguments against the possibility of union, or the rightfulness of such a thing. They maintain that every dogma or practice, and everything necessary to the constitution of the church, must be received in just such a sense as they conceive it, and they cannot conscientiously consent to any agreement which would seem even to ignore their views.

There are those who demand that the church should insist not only on what is absolutely essential to the faith, but claim to teach what is true on all subjects connected with it. The disposition to do this is not confined to any school or section. The Roman Catholic and extreme High Churchman on the one hand, and the sternest Protestant on the other, are equally apt to be the most uncompromising advocates for what they hold to be true and vital, and to be unwilling to enter into any compact which would force them to abate their claims.

But this attitude is coming to be regarded as unreasonable and unchristian. That which is described in the creeds as "the Holy Catholic Church" is something greater and bigger than any single Christian body now on earth. The salvation promised in the Gospel is not limited to channels provided for it through any existing organization. The fruits of the Christian spirit are

manifested in diverse and apparently contradictory systems. No man can say, I am holier than thou, and decline to hold fellowship with another Christian if he refuse to walk exactly as he does, or if he says so he proves that he himself has not attained to the highest holiness. It may be hard for many to give up cherished beliefs, to realize that men can obtain truth and gain holiness in different ways from those they have long esteemed the only ones, but the old universal method of testing truth by its fruits must be always applicable, and if the fruit be holy the tree also must be holy and be included in the garden of the Lord. The axiom of "unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials and in all things charity," is, we are perfectly confident, that which will eventually be universally accepted as the right and only possible one by which Christians should be judged, and which will lead to a real vital unity, and at the same time make possible progress and perfection in knowledge and in all virtue.

There will be those who will say that such an union as is proposed would be no real union, that it would be impossible for such diverse and incongruous elements to come together, or hold and work together. There would be such confusion and discord that, if attempted at all, such union would not last. We have more faith in human nature and in the power of the grace of God. If such a movement should go so far, after due conference and consultation, and the deliberate, prayerful, general acceptance of the principles on which the union should be based, the happy results which would immediately begin to appear, would make it so obviously desirable, that we have no fear whatever that it would not last and become more closely cemented in time.

As a matter of fact it is now claimed that there is a large unity of spirit among Christians, and it is true. Catholics and Protestants to-day, as they did not for-

merly, recognize each other as Christians, as animated and guided by the same divine Spirit, and working for the same general ends. And if Christians can so far live and work together amicably in different bodies, why should they not then do so in the one and same body, and gain the added power and blessing that would follow?

We have pointed out that there are large bodies in existence founded on this principle, in which there are great differences of opinion and practice, and yet there is substantial harmony and fellowship, and the immense benefit from acting together in one organization. The differences proposed to be allowed in one general national body including all Christians, could hardly be greater than those found within the various churches of the Anglican communion, and if they do not there cause disruption, why should they in this case?

In a nation there are vast differences of political views, and of temperament and habit, in its various sections. Fierce struggles for supremacy occur from time to time between the different political parties; yet the priceless benefit of an united nation is not destroyed thereby. Whatever the intensity of interest and feeling attending a national election, there is universal and unquestioning submission to the verdict of the polls. Shall Christians be less wise and less restrained and act on the crude and suicidal principle of rebellion and secession, if each group cannot force its views on each other group? That is what Protestants have been doing these centuries since they first began to claim the right of unrestricted freedom and individual action. But they are coming to see now that that principle can be carried to excess, that it should be balanced by a consideration of the opinions and rights and interests of others, and above all by what is wisest and best for the general welfare. And as education and enlightenment increase, and by the unanswer-

able logic of events, it will become more and more possible for substantial religious unity to be maintained, in spite of differences of thought or expression, as it was proved possible to maintain the integrity of the union of the country, notwithstanding grave political differences of view and sectional variations in the population. Christians must return to the conceptions of the church laid down by its Founder, as being like a net intended to gather in all, both the good and the bad. Every attempt to make it a small, select group composed only of the elect, the faultlessly good, or the absolutely orthodox, has always failed, and always will. The truest Christians are those who are most tolerant of those differing from them. So as men become more truly Christian they will become more tender in their consideration for others, more closely drawn to all who profess belief in the same Lord, and the bond holding them together will be more elastic and comprehensive.

There will be some so conscientiously convinced that they should stand for what they believe to be right, that, no matter what advantages might be gained, they could not enter into any union with others holding different views. They will doubtless think that they are acting on the highest principle when they put, as they say, "truth" before any other consideration, forgetting that they are making themselves the criterion and ultimate judges of what truth is, and that the surest way to arrive at the truth is by giving liberty of expression to all, and considering the views of all, in regard to it. Many a man has died a martyr to what he regarded as truth, which to others and in another age has seemed the very reverse. And many have done grievous injuries to the body of Christ by standing in their self will for opinions and practices which no one in these days would think of defending. Fortunately such can no longer have the power of coercing others as once they had, and

if they still choose to stand by themselves they must be allowed to do so, while the great body of the more rational and more charitable sweep on beyond them.

But some will maintain that more harm than good would result from union on these principles, that things are better as they are. They believe that in so gigantic an organization as that of a national church here in America, the machinery would be too cumbersome and complicated, would afford opportunity for the formation of bureaucracies, and for the creation of positions, or the exercise of personal influence, which would lead to practical tyrannies, injustices, and hardships and do more to injure the influence and retard the progress of true religion than is the case under present conditions. So they oppose all attempts at union. But if our political machinery is not too complicated and our governmental offices are not too numerous and liable to be misused, why should we fear these evils in the church? Undoubtedly there is great misuse of governmental positions, misappropriation of funds, distribution of offices as awards for votes, and employment of political influence. But there must be government officials, and we must have more or less machinery, and for the most part we do protect it from being used for personal or improper ends. In the church, where every one is supposed at least to be actuated by the highest and purest motives, and where as much as possible service is rendered voluntarily, it ought to be possible to preserve the purity of the officials and protect the interests of all. Certainly the evils dreaded are experienced under denominational institutions as well, and we should think the danger of them would be rather decreased than augmented by their formation into a larger body, which could command the highest talent and probity for its government. Certainly the advantages to be gained from the union of all Christians in one homogeneous body are so great and

so evident, that they could not possibly be counterbalanced by any evils which might arise, but which are incident to all human organizations. If there is one general legislative body for the whole of the United States, which is able to look after all its complicated social, political, and financial concerns, both domestic and foreign, why could not the simpler interests of the church be similarly managed? And if all the local interests of the nation are cared for by municipal, departmental, and state governments, could not the more sectional or domestic concerns of the church be attended to by like agencies, even if the church included the whole population? And there would be an immense saving both of money and time and energy now yearly expended by the several denominations in the many general and subordinate assemblies which are held, and the multiplicity of agencies maintained for different groups of people in the same localities. The sum required to defray the expenses of a general assembly of representatives of a single denomination in the United States is enormous, so that if there were but one such assembly for all, the saving would be immense.

Another practical objection that will be made to the particular scheme for reunion we have proposed, is that many clergymen would not be willing to come into any association in which a discrimination was made in regard to ministerial character. There are those who would claim that all clergymen must be recognized as "full ministers." But what does "full minister" mean? In an Episcopal Church there are ministers who are only "deacons." They cannot discharge the functions of a "priest," and "priests" cannot discharge those of a "bishop." But neither "deacons" nor "priests" resent the fact that they are not accorded the functions of "bishops." All Protestant ministers would have to be recognized as "bishops" if they were to be literally "full

ministers." And in fact there are those who assume that title and claim the power of ordination, which in Episcopal Churches is confined to bishops alone.

In view of the fact that in by far the larger part of the Christian Church there are these different orders of ministers, and that jurisdiction and ordination have been so generally confined to bishops, should it not be sufficient that those who do not care to receive Episcopal ordination, but have been consecrated to the ministerial office by some other method, should be recognized as none the less "ministers of God's word," and pastors and administrators of their own congregations, without their demanding the right to minister to those who feel that an Episcopal ordination is requisite for the discharge of all the offices of the ministry? Their personal qualities and abilities and charismatic endowments are fully acknowledged and may be thankfully made use of by all. It is simply a question of official authority. Some think that this may be conveyed in one way, some in another. If there are those who think that a Presbyterial or Independent ordination is sufficient, is it not enough that they should have full liberty to hold that view and to minister to all those who agree with them, without their wishing to impose their ministrations upon those who think differently? Would a Presbyterian or Congregationalist recognize an officer of the Salvation Army or a Quaker preacher, or even one of their own licentiates or lay evangelists, who might be a very eloquent preacher and successful saviour of souls, as a "full minister" with power to discharge all the functions of the ministry?

There is no personal slight intended, and there is no disparagement even, of non-Episcopal ministers, for one can readily acknowledge that a *de facto* government may have all the force and exercise the authority of one he regards as *de jure*.

There is no desire on the part of one set of men to

exalt themselves above another set. They do not claim to possess any peculiar privileges which they are not willing to share with others; they would be only too ready and thankful to do so. All they ask is that, while allowing full liberty of opinion and action to others, they should not be required to receive a ministry which they believe to be only of human origin, in place of one which in their opinion was divinely appointed, and to accept a theory of church government which admits of innumerable divisions, in place of one which can alone preserve its unity.

The feeling of resentment on the part of those not in Episcopal orders against those who do not recognize their "full ministerial" character seems to Episcopalians most groundless and unreasonable.

The Roman Catholic Church does not admit the validity of Anglican orders, but few Anglicans have any feeling of resentment against Roman Catholics on that account if that view is conscientiously held. And if that belief was the only thing that stood in the way of the union of the Roman and Anglican communions, the clergy of the latter certainly ought to be willing to receive any additional commission that might be deemed necessary to make their ministry acceptable to their fellow religionists. At least that, it seems to us, would be the reasonable and Christlike thing to do. To refuse to bring about a union of large sections of Christians on a ground of this kind would be to make a matter of personal pride of opinion a sufficient cause for division.

But in the proposed plan of union Presbyterian and Congregational clergymen would not even be asked to receive an additional ordination, unless they voluntarily sought it. They would simply be invited to come into one organization with their fellow Christians living under an Episcopal regimen, being fully recognized as belonging to the ministerial rank, with liberty to preach

the Word and to minister to their own congregations according to their own usages, only confining their ministrations to them, as a temporary arrangement, until all clergymen of the united church could be duly qualified to minister acceptably to all its members. This seems to offer the only practical solution of the problem of uniting all Christians in one body.

Moreover it is never claimed that the laying on of Episcopal hands conveys a divine grace and influence and confers necessarily upon the recipient spiritual gifts and graces which render him superior to other men. Ordination simply bestows the power which goes with official acts. All organized bodies recognize the necessity of some official authorization of their officers. And we believe that in the church the Holy Spirit does use and act through such instrumentalities. It is only a question then what sort of authorization is necessary. About this there is room for honest, reasonable difference of opinion. And it ought not to be regarded as a personal affront and grievance if it should be so much as hinted at that, in the opinion of some, one kind of authorization is superior to another.

It is really essential that this sensitiveness, where no offence is intended and there is no rational ground for it, should be overcome. There can be no possibility of a real consideration of differences, nor of effort to get over them, unless those differing are capable of understanding the conscientious position of each other, and admitting the possibility that those who hold opposite views to theirs may be right, or at least are honest in their desire of coming into agreement with those with whom they seek to confer.

We pray that we may "be delivered from all pride and prejudice which may hinder from godly union and concord," but we are apt to think that all the pride and prejudice is on the part of others, not of ourselves. If we

are so confident that we individually are right, whether we believe in the necessity of Episcopal orders, or that that is an unwarranted assumption, what is it but pride of opinion in each case? Or if we are so confident that union can only be obtained by others' coming to agree with us and not by our coming to agree with them, or that it is impossible that any common standing ground between us can be found, what is that but prejudice which makes accommodation impossible?

This whole subject must be approached in a different spirit. We all need humility and repentance, not only of the sins of our fathers, who by their self-confidence or blindness caused the divisions in the past, but of our own as well, which prevent us from even considering and discussing the subject as we should. It may be hard to create this spiritual attitude, but it must be secured to ensure success.

George Woolsey Hodge.

Former Secretary Church Unity Society,
Philadelphia, Pa.

VIA LUCIS

If ever I dig out
  Into the upper air—
Through dogma, creed and doubt—
  I'll surely find Him there.

But ever as I mount,
  I hear some wise one say:
"Your striving does not count;
  Truth walks the priestly way."

—*Charles G. Blanden.*

UNITY AT WORK IN PORTO RICO*

Christian coöperation in Porto Rico has developed to the extent so as not to be longer an experiment but a working reality among the seven denominations composing the Evangelical Union of Porto Rico, these being the Baptist, Christian, Congregationalist, Disciples of Christ, Methodist, Presbyterian and United Brethren. While the Union has no authority, it being entirely an agent of united effort, through it the missions unitedly are able to do a much needed work which neither of them could do working separately. It has become the clearing-house where new ideas, plans, and programmes can be presented and worked out for the use and benefit of all. This places at the disposal of each mission the experience of the others, and gives to the Evangelical work, through united effort, a stability and uniformity which could not be secured were each denomination working alone. The greatest gain, perhaps, is an invisible one: the confidence, prestige, and respect that Evangelical Christianity has won in the Island because of the united front it presents in undertaking the great task to which it has given itself.

The idea of coöperation had its inception in some of the mission boards in the United States before the first missionaries arrived on the Island in the year 1898, following the occupation of Porto Rico by the United States Government. It had reference at that time only with regard to territory, a principle which has always been held. With a view of promoting efficiency and coördination in the work the Federation of the Evangelical Churches of Porto Rico was formed in 1905, which had its annual meeting, where problems, plans, and programmes were discussed, and out of which recommendations were

*I acknowledge the kindness of Pres. J. A. McAllister of the Seminary and Rev. P. W. Drury, administrator of the "Puerto Rico Evangélico," in placing at my disposal, facts and records regarding this subject.

made for the benefit of the several missions, such recommendations having only the purpose to serve as counsel or projected plans with the approval of the best leaders and workers in the various missions. This plan continued until the meeting of the Regional Conference in Porto Rico in 1916, at which conference the representatives of the various boards in the States were present. At the Regional Conference the Federation was reorganized and became the Evangelical Union of Porto Rico, in which organization a closed union was effected. As is stated in article two of its constitution, "the object of the Evangelical Union of Porto Rico will be to promote cooperation among the various Evangelical denominations represented in Porto Rico, in all forms of Christian activity." It thus has no authoritative power. It can only observe, compare, study, propose. But the fact is that nearly every suggestion that has been made, and every proposition thus brought and approved, has become a reality.

The business conference of the Union is held each year in November. The delegates on the central committee compose the authoritative body of the conference, they being the only ones with power to vote on the final passage of recommendations. This committee is made up of representatives elected from each mission on the basis of membership—there being one delegate from each denomination and one additional for each 700 communicant members or major fraction thereof, natives being eligible on equal basis with missionaries. The conference has its constitution and by-laws. Its officers are president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, and executive secretary, all of which are elected annually from members of the central committee. So far the executive secretary and treasurer have always been reëlected. For a working plan the central committee is divided into four sub-committees—education, literature, social reform and evan-

gelism. On these there may be delegates appointed who are not members of the central committee, and said sub-committees are usually composed of one member from each denomination. The sub-committees are to make a survey of the work and needs of all the Island and with the facts which they have gathered during the year, they meet the first day of the conference and reduce to written form such recommendations as they desire to present to the central committee. This latter committee may accept, revise, or reject all or part of such reports. At the meeting of the central committee on the second day of the conference, discussion is open to all delegates, the voting only being limited to the delegates duly elected to this committee. When passed, these recommendations are published for the adoption by the several missions, and when so adopted they become the plans not only of the Evangelical Union but also of each coöperating denomination.

Some of the results of the union work as developed through the Evangelical Union are set forth in the following paragraphs:

First is a general working plan. From the beginning there has been in operation a comity arrangement regarding territory. During the first years this only existed as an agreement that two missions would not enter the same field. As the work has been more extended the territory of each mission has become marked by well defined lines. This has proved a wise and satisfactory arrangement by which there is no overlapping of work, there are no neglected places, there is no appearance of rivalry or competition—the exception to this being in the larger towns where the same principle is carried out. The success of this plan has been proved by the ease with which adjustments have been made where conditions called for such changes. The whole district of Lares was turned over by the Congregational Mission to the Pres-

byterian Mission. Later the latter mission turned over to the Disciples of Christ Mission a little triangle that was separated from their own field and nearly surrounded by the work of the latter. The only hitch in the process had to do with the price to be put on the property. This, however, was not as is the usual difficulty over prices. It happened that the purchaser insisted that the property was of greater value than the price asked by the selling mission. Of course, the difficulty was arranged without hard feeling on either side. But of even more interest is the fact that one of the denominations believes in and practices immersion and the other does not. Yet the transfer was worked out completely and effectively.

A second result is one common printing plant, book and supply deposit. This furnishes to all the same hymnbooks, the same church, Sunday school, and Christian Endeavor supplies. It gives all a very unusual opportunity to secure everything worth while that is published in Spanish. During the prohibition campaign, it supplied the churches with literally tons of literature. As a result of the last conference of the Evangelical Union, this plant is now printing a Spanish edition of a teacher training text-book for the Sunday schools. In all the States there is not an example of an interdenominational text-book for this purpose.* A subsidy to the book deposit and printing plant is maintained by the several missions, the amount given being in proportion to the membership. The book depository sells annually by mail an average of 5000 books. Recently a new linotype printing machine has been installed at an expense of about $4200. A plan for the incorporation of this enterprise with a capital of $60,000 and the establishment of

*Conclusion of Dr. J. A. McAllister after a survey of Sunday school text-books in the States last year.

bookstores in San Juan and Ponce is now in the process of realization.

This plant publishes the "Puerto Rico Evangélico," a semi-monthly religious paper which is the official organ of all the denominations. It has twenty-four pages of reading matter, is the best printed paper, and has a circulation of 4600, which is the largest paid circulation on the Island. On the same page are to be found the official notices, news notes, reports from the Baptists, Christians, Congregationalists, Disciples of Christ, Methodists, Presbyterians, and United Brethren. The administrator, Rev. P. W. Drury, D.D., is a missionary of the United Brethren. The editor is a native and a minister in the Baptist Church, having succeeded a Presbyterian of last year. The editor is chosen by a committee on publication composed of representatives from each denomination and is elected solely on the grounds of merit. He is elected for one year and eligible for reëlection. The union paper came into being from a growing sense of need on the part of the missions, rather than from a legislative process. During the first decade of work each mission built up its own religious paper, but seeing the opportunity of a more efficient paper through coöperation, the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and United Brethren united in 1912 in the publication of the "Puerto Rico Evangélico." In 1915 the Disciples of Christ and Baptists, and one year later the Methodists and Christians, joined officially in its publication.

Third is the Evangelical Seminary of Porto Rico. This being one of the greatest union projects was perhaps responsible for its being among the last to come into existence. The idea of a union seminary for training native ministers was advocated as early as 1904 or 1905, but failed of sufficient support at that time to become a reality. The reason for the failure was not the refusal on the part of certain missions to unite in such a project,

but the failure on the part of individuals in the various missions to feel the need of an institution of as high a standing as they felt the seminary must have. Thus it developed that each mission had its own school for the training of native pastors. One step toward unity was in 1910, when the Presbyterians and United Brethren united in one school. Another step came later, when the Congregationalists and Disciples of Christ sent students to the Baptist theological school. At the Regional Conference in 1916 a recommendation was passed favoring a union seminary. In the same year the committee on education of the Evangelical Union worked out a definite plan for such an institution. At the conference of the Union in 1917 the plan offered was accepted and sent to the home boards for approval. With but few modifications this plan was approved and the Union Evangelical Seminary began in Rio Piedras in the fall of 1919. It was formed by merging the four denominational schools then existing, as is stated in clause two of the constitution: "This institution shall be considered as the continuation of the "Seminario Theológico Portoriqueño" (Presbyterian and United Brethren), "Grace Conway Institute" (Baptist), and the theological schools located in Bayamón (Disciples) and Hatillo (Methodist). All graduates of the regular theological course in any of these institutions shall be considered as graduates of the new institution, and all others who have been students shall be considered as ex-students of the new institution." The seminary, now in its fourth year, has proved satisfactory not only to the seven denominations in Porto Rico, but students have come from Santo Domingo, Venezuela, and Cuba. The president of the seminary, Rev. J. A. McAllister, D.D., is a Presbyterian and did more perhaps for a union institution than any other man in keeping before the people the possibility and advantage of a union school for the training of native minis-

ters. There are to be found among the professors and instructors Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist and Disciples of Christ. Twenty students have gone out from the seminary and are now at work. There are thirty enrolled at present. Correspondence courses are also offered and 184 persons have availed themselves of these. The students that go out become intelligent, loyal ministers of their own denominations, and are in no sense colorless, vacillating weather vanes. They seem to learn that their message is Christian, although their working machinery may differ according to their denominational affiliation.

While the professors are supported by their respective mission boards, the running expense of the seminary is shared by the different missions on a proportionate plan according to membership on the Island, there being no condition as to the number of students any one mission may send. It so happened last year that some of the smaller ones had the larger number of students. In management all the denominations participate on equal basis, each having the same number of representatives. There is a plan at present, having the approval of the Evangelical Union, by which the boards are to buy the present rented property and put up other buildings and professors' homes to the value of $150,000. A three years' course is given corresponding to similar courses in the States. A high school diploma is required of applicants for the regular course, the ultimate aim being to enroll students who have the bachelor degree. This latter aim is in no sense considered an impossibility in the not distant future, as seven of the students at present are doing work in the University of Porto Rico for the bachelor degree. The seminary is located near the University of Porto Rico and enjoys affiliated relations with the same.

A fourth achievement is the work done in the field of

social and political reform. The committee on social reform keeps in touch with all progress and makes surveys regarding needs each year. These are embodied in a set of recommendations at the annual conference, and are sent out as standards and aims for education to churches all over the Island. When facts so justify, resolutions or a committee may be sent to leading officials presenting in a united voice the complaints as well as suggested remedies with the backing of all the Evangelical Churches. The success of prohibition in 1917 was attributed largely to the efforts of Evangelical Christianity. Also the Evangelical Union was one of the leading forces in the social purity campaign directed by the government during the war. At the Insular Tuberculosis Sanatorium near Rio Piedras one of the cottages was erected two years ago by the members of the Evangelical Union at a cost of some $3500. It represents more than 10,000 Evangelical Christians of Porto Rico uniting as disciples of the Great Physician to do something to help their fellow men without distinction of any kind.

Fifth is evangelism. An aggressive evangelistic campaign was inaugurated in the fall of 1921 known as the "Porto Rico for Christ Movement," and it is the purpose to extend and intensify the movement with the passing of the years. During the first four months of 1922 simultaneous evangelistic campaigns were put on in all the denominations with good results. For use in this common literature was published by the "Puerto Rico Evangélico." A similar plan is to be followed this year. In some parts of the Island teams of three or four ministers from different denominations were formed to visit and preach among the churches during the campaigns. Last winter a team composed of students of the seminary and led by one of the professors went out to many of the churches and spent the week-end, helping to present the plea of the Gospel.

Sixth is the summer conference. As a supplement to the business conference held in November, and yet independent of it, there is held each year in July for one week a conference, after the style of Northfield. The spiritual, practical, social, and athletic features are all made prominent and attractive. Prominent speakers from Porto Rico and other countries bring messages to these gatherings. This conference is open to all Evangelical workers on the Island. Last year there were 165 registered delegates. The officers were not able to invite others than native workers and missionaries, due to lack of accommodations. It is hoped that facilities will admit of the attendance of lay members in the near future. The fellowship in these meetings is excellent, workers from all faiths meeting and mingling on a common level with no thought or purpose other than to please the Head and Master of all.

Another feature of the Evangelical Union has to do with helping to correlate the various institutional work of the missions, so that there may be the widest extension of effort, yet without rivalry or competition, but always with the greatest possible coöperation and mutual helpfulness. The Presbyterian and Congregational hospitals are examples of this spirit. The Presbyterian hospital is located in San Juan on the northern coast of the Island, and the Congregational hospital is located in Humacao on the southeastern coast. While these are supported by their respective mission boards, their doors are open to all alike without regard to religious affiliation, and between them there has existed a splendid spirit of mutual assistance.

The Polytechnic Institute is a coeducational school located in San German on the western coast of the Island. It is of high school and college standing and is supported by the Presbyterians, but students from all denominations receive the benefits on the same plane,

and all the other denominations coöperate by furnishing scholarships. The same is true of Blanch Kellogg Institute, a girls' school of high school grade—only changing in this case the denominational name to Congregational. It is located in San Juan. Both of these schools have had to turn away a number of students this year because of the lack of accommodations, but plans are on foot for much needed enlargement in both institutions. There are two orphanages supported by the Methodists, but they receive children without discrimination. Also there are denominational institutions in Mayaguez and Rio Piedras supported by the Presbyterians and Baptists respectively, which, in connection with other work, are helping to prepare women workers.

The Union Church, while it was formed contemporaneously with the Evangelical Union, is now a constituent member of the Union. It was organized in 1916 by the union of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches which were conducting services in English in San Juan. Members of all Protestant faiths are now welcome for membership. An interesting thing regarding this union is that when the denominational churches were working separately they were served, almost entirely, by missionaries; but immediately on organizing the Union Church, it not only became self-supporting, but was able to contribute to mission work. The services are in English only. The pastor is the Rev. Charles B. Bare.

The latest statistics of the churches composing the Evangelical Union show 12,859 members in full communion, with 22,922 in the various Sunday schools and 4000 in the Christian Endeavor Societies. There are 175 churches and chapels and 76 other buildings valued at $1,843,700. The total amount contributed by the churches on the Island in 1921 was $52,284.

Another phase of union work, while not under the Evangelical Union, is mission work being done in Santo

Domingo. This is a project supported by the Presbyterians, Methodists, and United Brethren, and the Congregationalists, though not definitely affiliated, make contributions to the work. The work is carried on jointly by contributions from the churches here and the respective mission boards in the States on a proportionate plan. A former missionary in Porto Rico, Dr. Nathan H. Huffman, of the United Brethren, is at the head of the work there and three native men have been sent over as missionaries. This has made a strong appeal to the Porto Rican Christians to do missionary work among their own race, and offers a splendid opportunity to educate them in missionary giving.

While the present Evangelical Union is in no sense organic union, as the machinery of each denomination is held intact, the leaders in forming the present plan did not fail to consider the outlook and need as well as the obstacles in the way of organic union. The proposal came to the front very strongly about six or seven years ago and a conference was called to discuss plans for organic union. And in regard to this, as was true regarding education, the lines pro and con were drawn, not between missions but between individuals, regardless of denominational affiliation. The two main arguments against such a plan and which prevailed were: (1) Organic union at that time would have been artificial, and being in United States territory would have finally resulted in adding another denomination to the already too many in the United States. This seemed evident, as any form of organic unity would have required some statement of belief and methods of procedure. (2) There was the difficulty of relating such a union to the mission boards at home. Would the statements of belief necessary be acceptable to all the boards? If not, and the united organization should have been supported by one board, it would then become a part of that denomination.

The same men who took such a stand at that time are hoping that, when such time arrives that there are self-supporting churches in Porto Rico, they may organically unite. But if it then comes it will be a natural outcome of the desire on the part of the native Christians and not an artificial plan made by missionaries.

The usefulness of the Evangelical Union is increasing with the passing of the years. As the churches have learned to know each other better, by working at a common task, the bonds of unity have grown stronger. With rare exceptions, the spirit manifested in all phases of union work has been excellent, and the discussions at all the conferences have been of a high order. It continues to work in a Christian spirit, as was expressed by Dr. J. A. McAllister in a recent address: "By finding and appreciating the good in common, and by consistent, repeated, constant preaching, teaching, and living the big things of Christianity is the way to lead men to look to Christ as their Friend, Master, and Saviour; and to lead them to have a common interest in the same Master. And then, as the spokes of the wheel, as they come nearer and nearer to the hub, they come closer and closer to each other."

J. D. Montgomery.

Disciples of Christ Mission,
Bayamón, Porto Rico.

A CHRISTIAN UNITY OFFICE BUILDING IN MEMORY OF PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

A Christian unity office building is being erected in the city of Philadelphia, Pa. The Schaff Office Building is a memorial to the Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., pioneer and prophet of Christian unity fifty years ago. The Philip Schaff Memorial Committee, in coöperation with the Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church, is erecting this thirteen-story office building. The building will adjoin the present seven-story office building at the northwest corner of 15th and Race Streets, and the two buildings will be connected and operated as one.

The building has four street fronts with unobstructed light, and is within a square of the Parkway Boulevard on which are being erected publicity buildings, such as the Art Gallery, the Central Public Library, Victory Hall, etc. On the first floor of the Schaff Building there will be an auditorium with a gallery on the second floor, with a seating capacity of seven hundred. A distinctive feature will be the large windows in the auditorium. One emphasizes Christian education; another commemorates the work of the American Bible Revision Committee, of which Dr. Schaff was the organizer and the president, and who raised nearly fifty thousand dollars for its expenses. The third window will set forth the progress of federation and Christian unity from the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance held in New York in 1873, brought to this country largely through the efforts of Dr. Philip Schaff, to various family groups of federations up to the present Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, is President of the

Philip Schaff Memorial Committee, and Dr. Rufus W. Miller, secretary of the Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church, is secretary. More than one hundred eminent scholars and men of affairs in America, Great Britain and Europe are members of the committee: such men as Dr. George Alexander, president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church; Dr. David J. Burrell, pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York; Cornelius Woelfkin, D.D., G. U. Wenner, D.D., William Jay Schieffelin, Fleming H. Revell, Charles Macfarland, D.D., Alexander Henry, D.D., Frank Mason North, D.D., secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Hon. George Wharton Pepper, U. S. Senator, Bishop Charles P. Anderson, of Chicago, Maitland Alexander, D.D., Moderator of the Church of Scotland and of the United Free Church of Scotland; Rev. Sigmund-Schultze, Berlin; Professor A. Lang, D.D., Germany; Giovanni Luzzi, Florence, Italy; Rev. Charles Merle D'Aubigne, Paris, France. The late Bishop David H. Greer and the late Seth Low, LL.D., former mayor of New York, were also members.

The corner stone of the new building was laid January 13, 1923. Addresses were delivered by Dr. George W. Richards, president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the U. S., Dr. Lewis Seymour Mudge, stated clerk of the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A., and greetings were given by Bishop Berry of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Dr. W. Beatty Jennings, president of the Federation of Churches of Philadelphia; Dr. William H. Main of the American Baptist Publication Society; Franklin L. Sheppard, president of the Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work, and Dr. Mehlhorn of the United Lutheran Church. Messages were read from Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, chairman of the Philip Schaff Memorial Committee; Hon. William C.

Sproul, governor of Pennsylvania; Hon. Gifford Pinchot, governor elect of Pennsylvania; Hon. J. Hampton Moore, mayor of Philadelphia; Dr. Edwin W. Rice, president of First Day or Sunday School Society; Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; and Dr. William Elliot Griffis, eminent author, scholar and traveler.

It is expected the building will be ready for occupancy in August, 1923, and the dedication will take place in October, 1923. The building will house a number of church boards, church and inter-church agencies in addition to being a commercial office building. It is hoped to make the Schaff Building a center of church activities.

Monuments of bronze and marble are erected to commemorate the hero who, in a few battles, has served his country well; the orator who, by a few great orations has inspired his fellow citizens to enduring patriotism, and the statesman who, by some diplomatic triumph, has enriched and strengthened his nation. Is it not equally fitting that we should perpetuate the memory of one who for half a century of unremitting service in many spheres, won victories for truth and righteousness, inspired and trained leaders of men, enriched and enlarged the literature of the Christian Church, and promoted the union of Christendom. In these lines of service Philip Schaff was without an equal.

Debt of Gratitude to Dr. Schaff.

"I am a Swiss by birth, a German by education, an American by choice." In these words Philip Schaff was accustomed to express his three-fold indebtedness to Switzerland, Germany and the United States. The Christian churches of the world owe a lasting debt of gratitude to Dr. Philip Schaff. His is a name which the churches of America should not willingly let die. In the happier day of coöperative Protestantism, in this twen-

tieth century, it is well to remember that Dr. Schaff was a pioneer and a prophet.

Twenty Years Professor in Reformed Church.

For twenty years Dr. Schaff labored as professor in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, then at Mercersburg, Pa., now located at Lancaster, Pa. He came to this country on the personal invitation of a committee sent by the Synod of the Reformed Church to Europe. During that period he issued his history of the apostolic church, studied constantly and, by travel and his writings, became known.

Secretary New York Sabbath Committee—Professor Union Seminary.

It is significant that his first official work, outside of the Reformed Church, was as secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee, from 1864 to 1870, and in this Christian interdenominational work, he rendered invaluable services in checking the inroads of the continental Sabbath in our great cities. Under Dr. Schaff's leadership, Sabbath committees were formed in Baltimore, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, and other centers of population. The Sabbath cause was also brought before constituencies on the continent of Europe by his advocacy. In that early day Dr. Schaff stood for what is now known as social service. Later he became professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York; but in reality he was a Christian worker for all the churches.

Evangelical Alliance.

During a period of four years of incessant labors, by repeated visits to Europe and by correspondence, he became the chief instrument in bringing together the notable gathering of the Evangelical Alliance in New York City, 1873. Nothing, before or since, has occurred on the

American continent approaching it in the number of attending clergymen from abroad of established reputation. The sainted William E. Dodge was president, and actively coöperated with Dr. Schaff.

Alliance of Reformed Church.

Two years after the conference of the Evangelical Alliance, Dr. Schaff was a leading participant in the measures resulting in the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System—the forerunner of denominational federations or the family grouping of churches—and attended the old Catholic conference at Bonn. The Bonn Conference had representatives present from the Greek Church, the old Catholics, the Anglican Church, and several of the American churches.

It is quite in keeping with the mediatorial and unionistic feature of his career that Dr. Schaff should have had an active part in the Anglo-American revision of the English Scriptures of 1881-85.

President Bible Revision Committee.

He was president of the American committee, and raised nearly $50,000 to carry forward its work in order to give the revised Scriptures to the Christian churches of America. The New York *Tribune* well said of him: "Great as has been Dr. Schaff's work as instructor, historian, commentator, and an advocate of Christian freedom, his efforts for the revision of the Authorized English Version of the Scriptures must take the precedence."

Theological Mediator.

On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Dr. Schaff's labors as a professor, the University of Berlin sent a congratulatory address, speaking of him as the theological mediator between the East and the West, referring also to his remarkable career as an author and of his labors in behalf of church union, saying, among

other things: "You have ever made it your task to promote reconciliation and draw together the various parties in the church and everywhere, to bring about 'a speaking of the truth in love.' If the signs of the times do not deceive us, your work in this regard also has been crowned with special blessings. The various Evangelical denominations of your new home are, indeed, drawing nearer to one another, and their ecclesiastical and scholarly emulation no longer ministers to strife, but to mutual recognition and coöperation."

Editor and Author.

Who can estimate the influence of Dr. Schaff's labors as editor and author? The judgment expressed after his decease, by the American Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, that he was the most prolific of American theological writers, is probably capable of being substantiated. His literary activity was extended to many fields. If he was a church historian, he was a popular writer on contemporary national characteristics and personages. He made contributions to hymnology and to the literature of the Sabbath. He wrote catechisms for children and explained the creeds of Christendom for mature minds. He published twenty-two works in German, forty-eight in English, and was the general editor of one hundred or more commentaries.

Champion of Christian Union.

Even in his last days Dr. Schaff was the champion of Christian union. His death was hastened by going to Chicago, notwithstanding the prohibition of his physician, to read a paper on the subject, "The Reunion of Christendom." This remarkable paper fittingly closed his literary labors. He died October 20, 1893, and was buried in Woodlawn Cemetery, New York City. The

granite shaft which marks his grave bears this inscription:

Vivat Inter Sanctos

REV. PHILIP SCHAFF.

JAN. 1, 1819—OCT. 20, 1893.

A teacher of theology for fifty years. Historian of the Church. President of the American Committee of Bible Revision. He advocated the reunion of Christendom.

FOUR DISTINCT INTERESTS.

In his public career four distinct interests stand out prominently: his mediatorial mission between the Biblical scholarship and church life of Europe and America, his work upon the revision of the English Scriptures, his advocacy of Christian tolerance and the reunion of Christendom, and his labors as a church historian. Always he was a uniter of Christians and a pioneer and prophet of Christian unity.

DR. JOHN DE WITT'S ESTIMATE.

Dr. John De Witt, professor of church history at Princeton, in a letter to Dr. Schaff's semi-centennial, well summed up his invaluable achievements and the debt American and continental Christianity owes to him: "Your long, noble, and wonderfully useful life, we all thank God for. Like every minister in the country, I am your debtor. Author, editor, mediator between German and Anglo-American theological thought, ecclesiastical diplomatist, uniting American Protestantism in the Evangelical Alliance, and Presbyterians in the Alliance of the Reformed Church, and England and America in the Revision of King James' Version. I think your career an exceptionally great career."

HIS PRINCIPAL ACTIVITY.

The principal activity which was characteristic of Dr. Schaff's life was his unremitting labors for the kingdom of God and the churches of all faiths. It is fitting that his memorial should be not a pile of unproductive stone but a center of industries. The hope is entertained that the coöperation of representatives of all denominations in the erection and use of the Schaff Memorial Building will promote among the various denominations that unity for which Dr. Schaff earnestly labored and devoutly prayed. The building will cost in the neighborhood of one million dollars, and many gifts have been received in amounts from one dollar to five thousand dollars.

RUFUS W. MILLER.

Secretary Philip Schaff Memorial Committee,
15th & Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

HELP FOR COURTS OF HERESY

A little child shall lead them.—BIBLE.

COME, leave your candle, book and bell:
Is the man curst? His face will tell.
All records since the world began
Are written on the face of man.
His lack of love, his lack of awe,
Speak his defiance of the Law.
These Heresies are all there are,
In any heaven, in any star.

O, Judges, when the doubts begin—
"Should he be out? Should he be in?"
Call on some little child to pick
With hasty glance the heretic.
For all that have the gift of grace
Will have it printed on the face.
Only dark thoughts that darken fate
Have power to excommunicate.

Yet there is danger in my plan
Of finding who is under ban.
For what if—looking round about—
The child should pick the judges out!

—*Edwin Markham*

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

In *The Christian Herald,* New York, a writer says:

It is a difficult task for a divided Church to function in international peace when it has not learned interdenominational peace. Our divisions are growing more and more a shame and disgrace to Christianity. In the course of a six-months' trip across the continent and back, I spoke in Fresno, Calif., which is a most attractive town, but which is plagued with denominationalism, the Sunday morning paper announcing the services for that day—"Church of Truth," "First Swedish Lutheran," "First Church of Christ, Scientist," "First Congregational," "First Presbyterian," "Grace M. E.," "Swedish Mission Church," "Armenian Evangelical, Undenominational," "Nevada Avenue Church of Christ," "Arlington Heights Methodist," "Reorganized Latter Day Saints," "First Methodist Episcopal," "Pilgrim Armenian Congregational," "First English Lutheran," "Westminster Presbyterian," "Immanuel Lutheran," "Memorial Baptists," "First Baptist," "Unitarian Church," "Missionary Church Association," "Fresno Theosophical Society," "Bethel Pentecostal Church," "Progressive Spiritualist Mission," "First Spiritualist Church," "Danish Lutheran Church," "Normal Methodist Church," "First Christian Church," "Church of God," "St. Paul's Methodist Church," "North Side Christian Church," "Cumberland Presbyterian Church," and "First Armenian Presbyterian Church." When I called this condition to the attention of Rev. Dr. H. O. Breeden, minister of one of the largest churches in the city, he replied, "And that list is only about half of the varieties we have here."

The next Sunday I was in Los Angeles and one of their daily papers carried these announcements in order as follows: "Rosicrucian Church," heading the list with about six inches of advertisement; "Spiritualist Church of Revelation," "Church of Ancient Mysteries," "Francis Church of Truth," "Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society," "Society of Applied Psychology," "Home of Truth," "Universal New Thought Studio," "Krotona Institute of Theosophy," "Mazdaznan Message" (having to do with "Health and Breath Cultures"), "Buddhist Psychology," "Master Minds of Prophecy and History." All these advertisements ran two columns wide. Beginning on the next column it continued. "Seventh-Day Adventist," "Church of the Open Door" (Dr. R. A. Torrey), "Temple Baptist," "Wilshire Methodist," and three other Methodist Churches, "Church of the People," "Central Church of Christ," "Chirothesian Church of Faith," "First Presbyterian Church," and four other Presbyterian Churches, "First Church of Christ, Christian Science," and thir-

teen other Christian Science Churches; "Lutheran Church," nine of the National Council, five of the Joint Synod of Ohio, and three of the Missouri Synod; "Church of the Divine Power," "St. Matthias Episcopal Church," and "St. Paul's Pro-Cathedral," "Wilshire Boulevard Christian Church," "First Congregational Church," and four other Congregational Churches, "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints," "Unitarian Church," "International Bible Students' Association," "Practical Psychology," "Philosophical Circulating Library," "Kingdom of Light New-Era Church" and "Sunrise Services at Pacific Palisades, Santa Monica." These advertisements covered nearly the entire page.

Never was there a greater call for Protestant unity than in these times. It is an idle dream to contend in the strife as we are now doing. We Protestants must learn toleration toward each other and abandon building fences between ourselves. These fences are artificial barriers and ought to go down, and go down early if Protestant Christianity is to do its rightful task in America, not to speak of the world, which cannot be saved without a united church.

Our hope lies with the universities and the colleges. The students are open-minded and free. They are eager to help toward better conditions. It was a great privilege to stand in the gateway of the thought of the thousands of American students of all Churches, and challenge them to the task of friendliness toward the nations of the world through the channels of the church whose divisions must give way to a unity of brethren who are sent to win the world in the name of the Lord Jesus.

The American Church Monthly, New York, commenting on the action taken by the Philadelphia Presbytery regarding Dr. Fosdick and how church unity works in practice by having Dr. Fosdick, a Baptist, to preach for a Presbyterian church, says:

It appears that Dr. Fosdick is a Baptist minister. He was called to a Presbyterian pulpit in New York because of his eloquence, high character and great ability. We doubt not that, if eloquence, high character, and great ability were the essential requisites, Dr. Fosdick would be qualified to succeed Dr. Manning or Archbishop Hayes. But, then, if eloquence, high character and great ability had been the requisites, Marcus Aurelius would have been qualified to succeed Pius I. The common sense of second century Christians realized that no matter how decent and no matter how illustrious a man might be, no pagan could be the pope; in the same way, we should say no Baptist should fill a Presbyterian pulpit and no Congregationalist an Episcopal pulpit. The Presbyterians, as a whole, retain a lot of good Low Church orthodoxy,

which is a part of the inheritance of Catholic Christianity. The Baptists, from their sixteenth and seventeenth century beginnings, have always been one of the most radical sects. Under the worldly illusion that what they wanted was a good talker, this Presbyterian congregation chose a Baptist preacher. Now the Presbytery is shocked to find that the gentleman is preaching Baptist sermons. What could they expect?

It will always be so. When the doors are opened without strict doctrinal safeguards, it will mean that able and personally acceptable heretics will seize the opportunity to promote their heresies. The danger to the faith of all orthodox denominations cannot be overestimated. Looked at from the larger point of view, this is another case where the orthodox section of Protestantism finds the intellectual leadership of Protestantism leading straight toward Liberalism. Cannot the orthodox Presbyterians see that the only way to defend so much of the Catholic tradition as they have retained is to go back to the fuller Catholic tradition? So doing they will get a logical and firm position. Let the Presbyterians rally to the Bible, the Nicene creed, the baptism of regenertaion and the Eucharist of Christ's objective presence. If they will do that they can unite with us instead of with the Baptists.

The same paper reports the coalescing of Protestants in Germany:

A big feat of church union has recently been accomplished in Germany. There are twenty-six states in what Germans still call the German empire, and each of them has had until now its own distinctive Protestant church organization. In fact, there appear to have been two instances of duplicate organization within the same state—making for the whole country an array of twenty-eight denominations, drawing their history from the Reformation, by the spiritual lineage of either Luther or Zwingli or (as in the case of the Prussian Evangelical Church) of both.

Following the great war there developed for the first time a general desire for a national unification of these bodies. Three conventions between 1919 and 1921 were held to discuss the union idea and to plan for realizing it, and the hope came to consummation in the summer just past. At Wittenberg commissioners from twenty-eight constituent organizations empowered to form a united church, came together in the old monastery which was Luther's monkish home before he broke with the papacy and his family home later. After a devotional service at the reformer's hearthstone, the whole party went in procession by the door where Luther nailed up his thesis to the chancel of the old castle church where he preached so many years, and there, between the graves of Luther and Melanchthon, they ratified their joint compact of union.

There are many "federal" features in this union which designedly leave room for the constituent bodies to retain something of their old independent identity. That is possible in Germany because these uniting

churches have geographical limits. This difference, contrasting with the overlapping of denominations which prevails in America, makes feasible there a federalism which here is quite chimerical.

According to *The Continent,* New York, church union in Canada halts:

Union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist Churches of Canada is still being strongly opposed by a group of dissenting Presbyterians. At a recent meeting in St. Andrew's church of Toronto of members of the "Presbyterian Church Association of Ontario," attended by 700 persons, six speakers presented the case against union and for the continuance of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The speakers included Thomas McMillan of Toronto, Dr. R. G. Macbeth of Vancouver and J. H. Sinclair, M.P., of Nova Scotia. Mr. Sinclair said that the act of union violated the principles of civil law in force for which it was donated. He also advocated the sending of a strong delegation to the Canadian parliament when the measure that would legalize the union of the three denominations is to be voted on. At the Canadian General Assembly in Winnipeg in June it was evident that efforts to halt or sidetrack the union movement would be continued and that union could not be consummated until possible adverse legal complications were cleared away.

"Union of the Holy Spirit" was the subject of a sermon preached by the Rev. G. Herbert West, D.D., in the Gloucester Cathedral and from *The Guardian,* London, the following excerpt is taken:

For the new world which is so painfully coming to the birth we need a new vision of our Faith, new methods, new institutions and organization, new wine-skins in short for the new wine, and there is such a vision of the Kingdom ready to break into the world if men will only suffer it to break into their hearts. Behind all the branches of the church there stands the outstretched form of their living Lord, Whom all, in spite of their mistakes and errors, are earnestly striving to adore. All are seeking for a basis of Christian unity, and we may see it beyond all the various expressions of human faith and worship. The recovery of catholicity is the urgent need of the day, but the difficulty is how to begin. The operation of the Holy Spirit often appears more potent among those who are not recognized members of the church than among those who are. Through them we recognize that while the life of the church is the very life and power of the kingdom of God which is itself wider than the church and greater, yet the operation of the power of the Spirit in those who stand apart from the outward fellowship of the church would not be so great as it is if there were not in the world that very organism of the church

which was created and adapted to furnish the channels through which the life of the Kingdom shall be transmitted to all. . . . .

Will not Christ reckon as His own St. Augustine and Tertullian, Loyola, and Pascal, Livingstone, and Las Casas, Xavier, and Wesley, St. Francis of Assisi, and George Fox, Bishop Patterson, and William Carey, and thousands of others at least as different as these? What is it that unites them all? What but the Spirit of life drawn from the life of the Spirit? Ought not the recognition of His Presence in each to be the starting-point of a new brotherhood of man, which shall fulfil and carry on the fellowship begun at Pentecost? Is it not the same Holy Spirit which inspires the effective enthusiasm of the Salvation Army, the organizing skill of the Wesleyans, the strong sense of the supernatural and of the necessity for sacramental grace of the Roman and the Eastern Church, and not least, the widely embracing charity and doctrine of the Church of England? Different as they are, they are united in this—in the fact of the power of intercourse with God being granted to every man who seeks to know Him through Christ. We must believe as George Fox did in the Inward Light which lighteth every man, but we must not, as he did, reject the sacraments ordained by Christ and sacrifice the church to the individual. We must accept the active, loving rule of St. Francis, but not as he did, sacrifice the individual to the church. We need the spirit of self-sacrifice of St. Francis, inspired by the spirit of illumination of the Quakers. The spiritual life which both possessed is the recognition of the loving Spirit of God in our souls and in our lives.

But neither of them by itself contains the full result of Pentecost, which was to be the *Koinonia,* the fellowship. The primary work of Pentecost was to be the sweeping away of all "diffinities," racial or individual, to make men feel that God is a God of fellowship, that there is neither Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all. Something of this came by self-sacrifice in the noble response during the sore distress of nations in the war, but now in the perplexity which is tempting us to despair we must have spiritual guidance in the sad fellowship of our common woe.

The sense of responsibility, the energy of spiritual force, the power of a divine ideal, how can we gain them? asked our prophet-Bishop Westcott thirty years ago. To this question, he says, which is for us the question of all questions, the past returns no uncertain answer. Each new revelation of Christ among men has hitherto found expression in some social movement, in some form of disciplined life which has embodied and interpreted it. Could not the realization of the active energy of Christ's Holy Spirit in the world be embodied in the eyes of all by some fellowship which shall strike the imagination, which shall claim for the individual, for the family, and the nation their proper parts in preparing and welcoming the Kingdom of God on earth? Could not such a fellowship be formed into which all should be welcomed who profess and call themselves Christians, quite independently of the special branch of the church to which they belong? It should be simply spiritual, resting avowedly and solely on the belief that

the voice of God through His Holy Spirit is not silent among us, that the vision of God is not withdrawn from His people. . . . It must not weary of proclaiming that we maimed, the sick, the halt, the blind, and those who are whole in mind and body are all alike waiting for the moving of the waters which we believe is coming and that meanwhile we will live and move and have our being in God—that we know we are surrounded by sacraments of His Presence and His Grace for which we will thank Him, united in spirit, if not in bodily Presence, each in his own way and in his own house of prayer and worship. Such a fellowship of "brethren and sisters of the common hope" may seem to some visionary, says Bishop Westcott, but to others it will be only the expression of their deepest longings. And if it seem visionary, we should remember that it has already been realized on a large scale and under harder circumstances, with scantier knowledge and a less ardent longing for reunion than our own by Franciscans, by Moravians, by Quakers, and by the Salvation Army.

The whole field lies before us. We can look out now in a way that has never been possible before on all the provinces of the kingdom of God. We can communicate to others the noblest which we have, and save them from the long pains of our discipline. All things are ready. There is room for the growth in a rich diversity of outward form and expression corresponding with the varied gifts of humanity, of an all-embracing fellowship of children of the light, catholic as the spirit of freedom itself, but unified amid all its manifold manifestations by the central divine heart which sends life pulsing through the whole. The kingdom of God, for which the seekers after truth in every land are waiting, would gather into its beloved community all true hearts within the churches, and unnumbered multitudes in wider circles without, who are eager for a fellowship of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. Let our prayer be that of the Eucharistic prayer at the breaking of the bread given in the Didache:—"Just as this broken bread was once scattered in grains of corn over the hills, and having been gathered together became one, so let Thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom, for Thine is the glory and the power, through Jesus Christ for ever."

The Christian Century, Chicago, tells of a conference on Christian unity held at Lincoln, Neb., as follows:

In various parts of the country church leaders are meeting to study the problem of closer fellowship and common work among the churches. The long history of efforts to unify the church of God is of interest, both as showing the causes of division and the need and practicability of closer union. Jesus prayed that his people might be one, and the implication of his prayer is that the world will never take him seriously as long as his friends exhibit the spectacle of division. Paul hoped for the time when the church might come in the unity of the faith and knowledge of Jesus

to maturity of stature, by which he meant that we shall never grow up until we learn the art of unity. All conferences among Christian people looking to this end are therefore greatly worth while. During the past week such a gathering was held in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the joint auspices of the city Federation of Churches and the Ministerial Association. The Christian leaders of the entire region were invited, and the attendance was representative and encouraging. The sessions were held during two days. The speakers from outside were Bishop Kephart, President Wells of Grand Island College, and Dr. Herbert L. Willett of Chicago. Statements were made by denominational representatives regarding the contributions of their respective bodies to Christian unity, and there was full and informing discussion of the various themes presented. Rev. F. W. Ainslie of the Tabernacle Baptist church was the efficient organizer of the meeting. A continuation committee was chosen to provide for future conferences of like character, and to consider the wisdom of still more definite steps in the direction of coöperative work. Such conferences are of incalculable value as disclosures of the actual measure of unity prevailing among the Protestant churches, and the possibilities of more effective cooperation both in local and state areas.

A practical approach toward Christian unity is told by Prof. George B. Hatfield in *The Congregationalist*, as follows:

At the ceremony of the ordering of priests in the Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., Dr. Frederick E. Emrich, secretary of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Society, *participated.*

For the first time in history a minister of the Congregational Church, or of any other sect, jointed with the bishop and with priests of the Protestant Episcopal church in the laying on of hands in the service of ordination of a man to the priesthood of that church order. The admission of Dr. Emrich to the chancel, and so to a full participation, stands out as a remarkable and happy event in the communion of the churches.

The invitation extended to Dr. Emrich has in its history no feature of a complex ecclesiastical procedure, and therefore no debate upon its propriety or validity. The facts are simply that Mr. Laurence Frederic Eames, the candidate, expressed his desire to Rev. Edwin J. Van Etten, rector of Calvary Church, to have Dr. Emrich participate and Mr. Van Etten expressed himself to be in hearty accord with the idea. Bishop Vincent, the officiating bishop (Dr. Mann has not yet been consecrated Bishop of Pittsburgh), gave his approval without hesitation, and it appears, with pleasure. Such was the method of procedure.

To those who know the beloved Dr. Emrich, it will be easy to imagine with what joy this distinctive participation and recognition came, and to his friends who remember that he is in his seventy-fifth year, it will be in-

stinctive to believe that they could hear him say he had seen the coming of the Lord. And the real note of all was that it seemed natural and unchallengeable that due respect and recognition should be given to one who had been for many years a spiritual father of the young man who was to be ordained.

On the other hand, the hearty words of Mr. Van Etten bore witness to the fact that the privilege was granted without questioning or doubt as to validity and significance. His evident sincerity and pleasure in the unusual hour were apparent, and the welcome which greeted the guest from another church order as the members lingered after the service bespoke no uncertain gratification in what had occurred that day.

In an article on "Recent Trends in Protestantism" in *Scribner's*, Dr. Charles Foster Kent says:

In this age of coördination and coöperation, the fatal effects of these sectarian divisions are becoming ever more glaringly apparent. Confronted by the new and complex problems of rural and village communities, divided Protestantism, with its starved, competing sectarian churches, has thus far signally failed to meet its responsibility. In the foreign-mission fields it has in recent days been compelled to admit its inability to cope with the situation. As a result, plans for united missionary effort are being inaugurated which represent a long stride toward real Christian unity.

In more than forty towns in the staid New England State of Vermont, through the wise policy of denominational leaders, Baptist, Methodist, and Congregational churches have blended their resources. The result is the establishment in each town of one strong local church that elicits the cooperation rather than the criticism of the natural leaders of the community. The pastors are free to divide their work according to their natural ability or training. The religious education and the recreative life of the youth receive due attention. The entire religious and moral atmosphere of the community is being transformed. It is not strange that this movement is spreading like the leaven of early Christianity.

Significant, because it is largely due to the initiative of laymen, is the community church movement. Twenty years ago the name was scarcely known. Now there are between eight and nine hundred well-organized community churches in America. Seven new community churches are being launched each month.

While still crude and germinal, this movement has far-reaching possibilities, for it accords closely with the ideal of the Founder of Christianity, and especially with the needs of our village, suburban, and rural life. Its momentum and nation-wide extension are evidence that it is not a mere flash in the pan. Already sectional conferences are bringing together its leaders and unifying the movement. It promises soon to become one of the most significant trends in Protestantism, and may furnish a satisfactory solution of the rural problem.

Dr. G. W. Richards, Lancaster, Pa., writing in *The Quarterly Register,* Edinburgh, says:

Two apparently contradictory movements came in the wake of the war. The one was for closer relations among the churches; the other for intensification of the denominational spirit. The Inter-Church World Movement and the American Council on Organic Union of Evangelical Churches were the result of the former, the first a failure and the second so far not a success; the Forward Movements, under different names, in the various Churches were part cause and part evidence of the latter. The recrudescence of denominationalism was paralleled by the revival of nationalism, each deferring, if not defeating, the ardent hopes and the practical schemes of a new interdenominationalism and a new internationalism. With a show of reason, therefore, the Rev. L. W. M'Creary writes in *The Christian Century*: "It was thought that the church would profit by the experiences of the war and that hereafter a closer unity and coöperation would characterize all religious endeavor. Instead it may be seriously doubted if there has been a time in the last twenty years when denominationalism has been more assertive."

So far little has been accomplished in the efforts at closer union of the churches beyond alliance and federation. Organic union has had doubtful success. The union of the Northern Presbyterian and of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was effected, but the gain was partly offset by a resolute remnant of Cumberland Presbyterians who have maintained an independent organization after years of litigation which stirred up much bitterness of feeling. The proposed union of the Congregational, United Brethren, and Methodist Protestant Churches, after a decade of negotiations failed. The churches, North and South, like the Presbyterians and Methodists, have discussed reunion in conference and committee meetings, but the outcome has been disappointing. The Commission on the World Conference of Faith and Order is composed of representatives of the leading churches and such a conference may reasonably be expected. There are those who make light of it and are sceptical about its results. With no small degree of enthusiasm the American Council on Organic Union was organized in Philadelphia, 1919-1920. Its Plan of Union, however, was defeated by the Presbyterian Church, North, which itself, through its General Assembly, had taken the initiative in calling representatives into conference for the purpose of considering organic union. The Council is still in existence, but its influence has been diminished by the action of the Presbyterian Church. Everyone knows the disastrous failure of the Inter-Church World Movement, which perhaps more than anything else has temporarily cooled the ardour for church union.

The organization which has not only survived the war, but has been one of the most influential agencies in the war, and has come out of it with renewed vigour, is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. This is doubtless the most hopeful and helpful organ through which the churches of America are coöperating in moral and social work. It seems to meet

the common demand for closer relations between the churches, disavowing organic union and standing only for federation of independent bodies. Yet there are enough voices crying for closer relations than federation to justify the belief that the Federal Council is not the final stage of church union. It must either increase and lead to something beyond itself, or it will decrease and end in a revision to the original denominationalism whose ills it sought to cure. At present, however, the union movements among the churches are at a standstill, but by no means at an end. The leaders of the churches are watchfully waiting for the directions of their Lord.

In *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Rev. H. P. Scratchley says:

There is one aspect of Christian reunion that is either omitted or very slightly touched upon in all the scheme to bring about a reunion of all those calling themselves Christian. Certain outward phases of the church have been put forward as the basis of this reunion—the externals, if one can so call them, of church life. It is true that these must be. There must be always the outward, visible manifestation of the inward, spiritual. Life is manifested in a body, but life is not the body, nor the body the life. So with the Church of God. There must be an organization, a body, through which and by which God the Holy Ghost, the indwelling life of God, works in the world, but this body is not the Holy Spirit; it is simply that by which He does His work in the world. The Gospel of Christ was preached through, and by, men whom He had chosen, and by the *Ecclesia*, the Body of Christ, an outward organization seen of men, doing its work among men. This work was done by known organs, the ministry, the sacraments, the creeds. Grace was given by and through these. Every body must have that by which it is held together; there must be a common belief, a creed, be it long or short, as a statement of principles of its life; there must be some visible means by which grace is given and received; sacraments, be they few or many, be their nature what it may be; there must be human agents by whom its functions are operated, the ministry. No body can exist or has existed without these. Even those bodies which have started without organization have been forced to form some kind of central body for better working; those which have started without a settled ministry, have been compelled to have one; those which began with a denial of the sacraments of the Catholic Church have made others for themselves.

These are the outward, visible parts of the Body of Christ. Unity is not in them; they are manifestations of the unity of that life. It is conceivable that they might not have taken the form they have, and the unity of the church have yet remained. Unity is made by the indwelling of God the Holy Ghost, the spiritual reality within. It is pure legalism, the legalism condemned by St. Paul, that has led to the over-emphasis of any one of these, that makes the way to reunion through the form of the ministry, or the number of the sacraments. It was the literal, legalistic conception of

the Calvinists that made the first schism in the Church of England; the insistence that the Bible gave in exact form the ministry, that the exact code of laws as to orders was given in the New Testament. The Elizabethan bishops held the theory that the church was at liberty to change the form of ministry, but that no national church should break with the past save on grounds of necessity. The *impasse* was not with them, but with the legalistic Puritans. So, later, the legalistic conception of conformity, together with the spiritual complacency of the Established Church, forced the Wesleyans into schism. Nor is this legalistic idea of the value of the outward uniformity lacking to-day. To many of us it seems to be the only bar to reunion among the Protestant bodies. Most of them acknowledge the validity of each other's ministry; there seems to be no objection to a difference in creed; they have the same type of service; and yet, in the small villages of the land, they stay apart, saying, I am of John Wesley, I am of John Knox, I am of Thomas Campbell.

There is but one reason for separation just as there is but one reason for union. This is the truth of God. The truth as it is in Christ is the sole basis of unity. If the Christian people of today are ever to attain to unity, it must be through the acceptance of the truth. It is not a matter of expediency, the better working of a parish; not a matter of economics, the useless expense of running small bodies in villages, with the consequent inadequate pay of the ministry. To read most of the reasons given for union churches, one would conclude that the Faith, "once for all given unto the saints," had little to do with the question. If Christianity be a matter of pure business, then let us unite, just as corporations unite, let us divide territory, just as they divide, but if that which makes us what we are is a matter of truth, then let us stay separate. So the sole question before Christians today is the truth of their religious beliefs.

On "The Breaking-down of the Denominational Church," Rev. Joseph Ernest McAfee, writing in *The Christian Century*, says:

There are now 200 or more different denominational bodies in the United States, and they are multiplying all the time. Doctrinal and other schisms in each of the larger denominations threaten their disintegration into smaller bodies. Our tragic embarrassment in American religious life is that we have not enough denominations to give sincere expression to spiritual enthusiasms, though the landscape is so infested with them that their numbers cause our most acute religious distress. Such a dilemma is certain to get us sooner or later. We shall be impaled upon one horn or the other. Our denominational churches are too rigid. They must be broken and fall to pieces in just the degree that our spiritual life becomes sincere and vivid. Our denominational machines are lumbering. They labor and creak and groan under their institutional load, turn out a product with

which nobody is satisfied, and occupy the room which an enlightened social science must speedily claim for contrivances designed to serve the manifest religious needs of our society.

Thus, for our spiritual *e pluribus unum,* the denominational church falls short of the unity which is essential, and fails to provide the kind of diversity not less imperatively required.

* * *

Here is a town with four resident pastors. He in longest residence has been in the town almost three years. During that time he has seen the pastors of each of the other churches change twice and two of them three times. Another town of ten churches has not a minister in town, resident for more than two years. These are not isolated instances. In wide sections this is the rule. In one state, where numerous home mission pastors give the denominational system its least trammeled opportunity, pastorates being subsidized and thus largely controlled by the denominations, it is reported by denominational superintendents that pastorates average less than two years; in the smaller communities, where constancy of residence is of the first social importance, it is less than one year.

Nobody excuses these conditions or desires to see them prevail. No one would be so wicked as deliberately to contrive them. We fall short not in deploring them, but in failing to realize that they are the legitimate result of our denominational program. If we do not like them we ought to cease to like the denominational church, and hasten to find some program which would not make such havoc among spiritual values. Many of us are very fearful that someone will say or do something which will bring religious interests into peril. We deprecate disparaging remarks about our churches. These conditions are more or less familiar to all, but none must cast slight upon the system which produces them, lest religion be brought into disrepute. The solution lies, for these persons, not in abandoning the denominational church, but in charging it with the spirit of Christ, in banishing its self-seeking, and inducing Christians of all names and orders to love one another. How long will we be in discovering the shortsightedness and folly of such proposals! Keep the mill running, but do not permit it to deliver its grist! The reason the spirit of Christ does not prevail is largely because we persist in keeping this denominational program in operation. It generates the evil spirits which we so loudly deplore. And it will continue to generate them, so long as it exists and operates according to its essential genius.

Let none be alarmed for our denominational system and our denominational churches. No malicious foe has appeared anywhere to do them harm. They will fill the domain of American religion without challenge as long as the breath of life remains in them. When they die it will be by a natural death. But is it not apparent that they are dying? Their only signs of survival are those which are confronting them out of resemblance to themselves, and are steadily making of them new creatures. Having become these new creatures they will happily have ceased to be denominational churches.

Dr. A. C. Headlan in a recent address in St. Alban's Church, London, said:

Dr. Selbie says: "Free churchmen feel that, ever since Lambeth, the emphasis has been too strongly laid on the side of order and organization." That may be so, but if you think a moment you will see that there are very good reasons for it. In the first place, most of the divisions of Christendom with which we have to deal have been caused by questions of order. You can see that if you look at the many names which are used—Papacy, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Cangregationalists: each one of those represents a question of order; and if, therefore, the divisions have come through questions of order, it is quite obvious that the problems of order are some of the most important that we have to approach.

But further, Dr. Selbie goes on to say, that the various conferences that have been held, show that in all substantial matters there is unity of faith. That, I think, is true. The divisions between different Christians at the present time, so far as faith goes, are not divisions between the church and the Congregationalists or the Presbyterians, and so on; they are divisions which run through all the different bodies: divisions which arise from such questions of criticism as Modernism, the doctrine of the Atonement, the best method of stating the doctrine of the Incarnation: on all those points the divisions are within the different religious bodies and not between one body and another. On the fundamental facts, I believe, in Jesus Christ and everything that is implied, there is a great substantial body of unity. If that be so, if we recognize that there is this great body of unity, then what we have to do is to try to express it in corporate action. It is the need of expressing that unity, the one faith through the one society, that makes the discussion of the question of order necessary. That is a very great problem for all Christian people and for the united church, to decide exactly how much unity of order is required. On the one side you have the Roman Church, and the volume on the Roman Canon Law shows that there is a church with a very elaborate and very carefully worked out system of order, penetrating into every particular relationship of life. Dr. Selbie's own church, the Congregationalists, would, I suppose, represent very much the opposite way of looking at things: the great stress laid on congregational liberty, the great stress laid upon individuality, the fear of checking the life of the spirit by the influence of bureaucracy. This is the problem before us and which we are approaching: What amount of unity of order is necessary in the Christian Church? On the one side, undoubtedly we require some order. If the whole of the Christians in England are to be united in one society you must have some sort of system of order. On the other side, I suppose we all, as Englishmen, dread very particularly the evils of anything like bureaucracy. We feel that we want individual initiative. In the Church of England we have very great variety, and every effort to increase to any excessive extent the idea of order immediately creates some sort of revolt. Therefore, the problem before us is this: What amount of order do we really require in the Christian Church of the

future? The only thing I will say in answer to that is, let us turn our eyes to the early Christian Church. There you have a quite natural system of order, but you have very great elasticity, very great initiative, great power of adaptation to new circumstances, and I think that if we agree in studying that representation of the Christian order, we shall get the best guide to what we require in the future.

The *Challenge,* London, gives the following report of Bishop Temple's word concerning unity in his recent address to the National Free Church Assembly on "Good Will in Church Relations":

Dr. Temple said the way towards the full expression of unity in organisation was, first and foremost, the concentration of our minds upon our common faith and our common task. We ought to regard ourselves, as the early church could not help regarding itself, as a relatively small army sent out to conquer a vast territory. If we had that sense of our true vocation in the world disunion would rapidly disappear. He believed it was for our common good that fundamental doctrines were again prominently in question, for by perpetual meditation upon them we would discover our unity in the things that mattered most. The first need was a resolution on the part of all to put first things first. He was hoping to see far more united action in witness to central and common beliefs. We were once again vividly aware that the church has world-wide connections and claims, and the sense of the contrast between the Christian and the unconverted world was again revealing the real unity there was among true Christians. We should be united in common thought in order that we might get such guidance as we could with regard to the obligations of Christian Churches to the whole ordering of political, economic, and social life.

The Australian correspondent of the *Guardian,* London, reports the following concerning the growth of Christian unity in Australia:

A good deal is being done in different parts of the Commonwealth by several of the religious bodies to keep alive the discussion of Christian reunion. In furtherance of the recommendation of General Synod, the Primate lately convened the committee appointed by the Synod, when it was decided to endorse the suggestion that some literature on the subject should be circulated, and also a half-yearly report of the proceedings of the committee. A conference has also been held of delegates from the Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Anglicans to arrange for a Federal gathering in March, at which there shall be twelve representatives of the Church of England and eight from each

of the other bodies, who shall confer with the Lambeth appeal as the basis of all deliberations, upon such crucial questions as the creed, episcopacy, ordination, and any possible lines of immediate coöperation. Here in the Commonwealth our non-Episcopal brethren are showing much greater readiness to discuss the vital issues of the subject in a temper of fraternal frankness than appears to be the case among the Nonconformists of the homeland. And there is everywhere a grateful recognition of the breadth of spirit permeating the Lambeth declarations.

In the *Christian Century*, Chicago, Dr. J. M. Buckham of the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., says:

A subtle and disastrous foe of the peace of the church, closely allied to the former, is the spirit of persecution growing out of reactionism and bondage to tradition. Bitter fruit and copious has this spirit borne. It shows itself very early in the life of the church. Paul felt it keenly, and the epistle to the Galatians is his rebuke. It did not, however, get a firm footing in the church for several centuries. Vacondard in his history of the inquisition writes, "As late as the middle of the fourth century, and even later, all the fathers and ecclesiastical writers who discuss the question of toleration are opposed to the use of force." Since that time many of the great free-born souls have had to meet this foe—some at fearful cost to themselves and the church. Which of the prophets has not been stoned by it? The list of its victims, including not only the innocent but the illustrious, is appalling. Among them, none speaks more eloquently than John Hus, who after five hundred years is so stirring the land of his labors today. In building the monuments to such martyr prophets, why not build that greatest and best of all monuments,—a repentant and reunited church?

It is a long and dismal record of individuals, groups and bodies of Christians cut off from the main trunk of the church by the spirit of uncompromising traditionalism, ruthlessly maiming the church and leaving her poorer, weaker, less Christlike. There is something peculiarly subtle and deceptive in the assumed duty of suppressing heresy. The exercise of authority against supposed error seems to be obligatory; yet this is a delusion which Paul punctured in the fourteenth chapter of Romans, forcibly enough to be remembered.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE logical approaches of Christendom toward reunion appear to be by the way of those bodies that are nearest kin. The Anglican Church is drawn both toward Rome and Geneva. While the Lambeth Appeal called for responses from the Nonconformists, Lord Halifax has been having an interesting discussion with Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines. This has been published under the title *A Call to Reunion* (A. R. Mowbray & Co., London). The purpose of the publication is to contribute something in preparation of ways toward a conference between duly authorized representatives of the Churches of Rome and England. Insurmountable difficulties will be far less formidable when discussed face to face in the spirit of Christian charity. The hope of reunion in these times is the growing conviction that the conference method is gaining confidence.

Out of an interview between Lord Halifax and Cardinal Mercier, the latter requested the former to draw up a memorandum for a basis of discussion. This memorandum had to do with the question—What constitutes the church? What do we mean by the words in the creed, "*Credo * * * in unam sanctam ecclesiam catholicam*"? He points out the two different ideas, first, in reference to the church as a body with a visible government, and possessing external jurisdiction, and secondly, as meaning the kingdom of souls, that Body of which Christ is the Head. He elaborates upon this and says that it "is not to assert that God cannot, if He so wills, operate outside the Sacraments, but only that the Sacraments are the means, the ordinary channels, by which grace is given to us, and the supernatural life, derived from Christ the second Adam, is bestowed upon us." He associates the Anglican Church with this interpretation and the Church of Rome with that of external government. The former interpretation would find support in the Eastern Orthodox Church according to Khomiakoff, who speaks of "the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of souls, the church in fact, is a kingdom not of this world."

He argues that as a daughter of the Church of Rome, the Church of England received her later Christianity from Pope Gregory the Great and St. Augustine and recognizes the duty devolves upon her, equally with Rome, to strive, without sacrificing the truth, to restore the relations which once bound them together, but if we are to expect Rome to maintain her traditional position, Rome should recognize the difficulty in asking the Orthodox and Anglican Churches to deny the original deposits of their traditional faith. Both churches hold much in common, which has been obscured by misunderstanding, ignorance, and exaggeration. Dr. Pusey, in the eirenicon addressed to Cardinal Newman, affirmed that the English Church has not rejected a visible head, but only disowns, as the Eastern Church does, the monarchy of the Bishop of Rome.

The Cardinal argued that without the papacy the church's unity could

not be maintained. To this claim the Cardinal gave special prominence in his Pastoral Letter, which he addressed to his diocese on his return from the conclave for the election of the Pope. Lord Halifax gives publication to the entire letter.

Lord Halifax has made some valuable statements. From some we would dissent. To make clear his position, this review closes with two quotations as follows:

Is it not time for Christians to forget their internal divisions, and fix their eyes upon the future? Why confine our attention to the disputes that have divided Christendom in the old days instead of attempting to agree on what terms we can come together in the present? Are there not grounds sufficient to enable us, without any sacrifice of principle, to enter into negotiations which might pave the way for reunion? There surely is room for mutual explanation about important outstanding points. If it be recognized, as was explicitly done by Leo XIII, that the episcopate derives its jurisdiction directly from God, what need hinder us from acknowledging that our Lord contemplated for the Church an episcopate acting, not in submission to, but in union with, the Apostle upon whom He had bestowed the gift of the keys? "For the successor of S. Peter," as Bishop Gore[1] has said, "to be something other bishops are not is surely a very different thing from the successor of S. Peter being to other bishops the source of what they are." As Archbishop Bramhall[2] says: "Concerning Order or interior jurisdiction I know of no controversy between the Church of Rome and us but one whether the Bishop of Rome alone does derive his jurisdiction immediately from Christ and all other bishops do derive theirs from him." Acknowledgments should not be difficult on both sides. The bishops in communion with Canterbury, if other things can be agreed upon, have declared their willingness to accept, with regard to Holy Orders, whatever may regularize their position in the eyes of the Roman and Oriental Churches, in the same way as we are asking the Presbyterians to regularize their position in our eyes.

* * * * *

It is a new world in which we find ourselves, and which, in its divided condition, calls for that help which human efforts seem powerless to afford. It has been said that Christianity is not tolerant of any civilization other than its own. If this be true of the older civilization which Christianity has rejected, what hope can we form of a civilization which was once Christian, but which is more and more discarding the principles of that Christianity to which it owes its existence? What was responsible for the late war but a cynical disregard for all the principles of the Gospel? What can be more antagonistic to those principles, as the Cardinal has pointed out, than the war of classes, and the enmity between labor and capital throughout the world? If universal selfishness is to be substituted for the regard for the common good, and the welfare of our neighbor inculcated by the old

[1]Formerly Bishop of Oxford.
[2]Anglican Archbishop of Armagh in the time of Charles II.

morality, can we escape a catastrophe such as the world, even in its worst moments, has not yet seen? What will be the future of our children if those principles which have, for the most part, been recognized as governing the laws of Christian morality are to be disregarded? But it is useless to enlarge upon what must be obvious to all who give the matter serious thought. The question we have to consider is how best to meet the dangers, which threaten all it most concerns the world to preserve. Cardinal Mercier, in the conclusion of his Pastoral, emphasizes the fact that, apart from our Lord Jesus Christ, there is no salvation for states or individuals. There is no redemption, our Lord tells us, apart from Him, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." How, then, in this our day, can we labor most effectually to bring the world back to the feet of Christ? A house divided against itself cannot stand; it is the reunion of Christendom that we have to seek, and for which we have to pray.

A constructive word concerning the present situation in Christian unity is spoken in a little book entitled *Impasse or Opportunity?* by Malcolm Spencer, M. A., Secretary of the Student Christian Movement. The sub-title, The Situation After Lambeth, gives a clue to the author's purpose. He explains in the preface that, "What I have written, I have written under a sense of strong constraint. It has seemed to me that the Lambeth Appeal has opened to the church a door of great opportunity; and no one is hastening to go through. If anything I can say can open that door a little wider, I am bound to say it. I am especially debtor to the cause of Christian unity, for I have had, for a free churchman, unique opportunities of entering intimately into the catholic position." The book is a challenge to both sides and to all not to falter in the face of the difficulties which have come up in connection with the "Appeal" and the "Responses" made to it by the bodies which have considered it, but to take hold of the problem of separation and reunion with greater courage and devotion. In one chapter after another the author gives a helpful kind of "mutual interpretation" of the values of the creeds, orders, sacraments, and experience of religion.

Another interesting and enlightening book which has come forth to speak a word in season by way of interpretation of the Lambeth Appeal is *Lambeth and Reunion*, by the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar, and Hereford. "We have endeavored," they write in the last chapter, "in the preceding chapters to fill in some of the outlines of the Lambeth Appeal, and also to re-create the atmosphere in which it was shaped. This last is all-important, for of necessity the Appeal must be read and criticized in an atmosphere and from a standpoint very different from those in which it came to birth. Moreover, we realize how lengthy an education will be required before our own people, not to speak of others, will see it in its true setting and understand its true import." The major interest and concern of these bishops and of their book is of course for the great cause of Christian reunion itself. "Christianity," they affirm, "can supply both the ideal way of life and the spiritual momentum by which man can attain it.

But it can only be adequately supplied by the impact on the world of a united church. Therefore the call of the world for the reunion of Christians is one whose solemnity and urgency cannot be put into words. We shall disregard it at our peril.''

One of the most beautiful and appropriate day by day books is *A Diary for the Thankful Hearted* compiled by Mary Hodgkin (Methuen, London). There are quotations from more than two hundred and fifty authors for all the days in the year, every quotation emphasizing thankfulness. Some are in poetry and some in prose, but many of them are so fine and healthy that one will memorize them as a safeguard against those periods in life when ingratitude and selfishness crowd out songs of praise and affirmations of thanksgiving.

In *The Churches Allied for Common Tasks,* The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America presents a valuable story of its work. The book is, in the main, a record of the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America from 1916 to 1920, as presented at the Quadrennial Meeting of the Council at Boston, December 1-6, 1920. When taken in connection with the statements made by the interdenominational agencies carrying on the missionary and educational work of the churches, which are also printed herewith, this report may be fairly said to constitute an important survey of the coöperative work in which the churches are to-day engaged.

A word for the friendship of the English-speaking peoples is spoken by Joseph Fort Newton in *Preaching in London, A Diary of Anglo-American Friendship* (Doran). The book is delightful and charming as are all of Dr. Newton's writings, and what is more important it helps toward the international understanding and appreciation so much needed to-day.

Another little book which speaks a timely word on a matter of special international interest and importance is *What Japan Wants* (Thomas Y. Crowell Co.), by Yoshi S. Kuno, Professor in the University of California. Professor Kuno is characterized as a Japanese writer who can see both the Oriental and the Occidental viewpoint.

A book of unusual interest is *Dynamis Formen und Kräfte des Amerikanischen Protestantismus,* by Pastor Adolf Keller of Zurich. Dr. Keller is recognized as one of the most untiring workers for Christian unity. He was a recent visitor to the United States and out of this visit he has written his book. It is a careful and able study of the ecclesiastical and religious situation in America, both in its historical background and its present day setting. It is to be hoped that this book will soon be translated into English.

A charming tale of the stirring days of King William of Orange is *The Bracegirdle,* by Burris Jenkins, (Lippincott's). In this stirring romance several famous characters are made to live again.

INDEX TO VOLUME XII

AUTHORS

Balanos, Demetrios Simou
Belden, B.D., A. D.
Clark, Rev. William C.
Fortune, Ph.D., A. W.
Garrison, LL.D., J. H.
Garvie, D.D., Principal Alfred E.
Grubb, M.A., Edward
Hall, D.D., Professor Francis J.
Hodge, D.D., George Woolsey
Idleman, D.D., Finis S.
Kershner, LL.D., F. D.
Lynch, D.D., Frederick
Miller, D.D., Rufus W.
Montgomery, Rev. J. D.
Nikolaos, Most Rev.
Pettee, Miss Julia
Smith, Rev. Fred
Smyth, D.D., Newman

SUBJECTS

PAGE

Approaches Between the Anglican and Swedish Episcopates, By Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., Editor Christian Work, New York City 60

Christian Reunion From the Quaker Point of View, By Edward Grubb, M.A., Letchworth, England 127

Christian Union—Some of the Greatest Obstacles, By Rev. J. H. Garrison, LL.D., Los Angeles, California 48

Christian Unity Office Building in Memory of Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., A, By Rev. Rufus W. Miller, D.D., Secretary Philip Schaff Memorial Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania . . 292

Church Unity, Being the Report of a Joint Conference Held Recently at Lambeth Palace 106

Consolidation, By Rev. William C. Clark, Pastor Congregational Church, Bakersfield, Vermont 199

Coöperation the Road to Unity, By Rev. A. W. Fortune, Ph.D., Pastor Central Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky 169

Disciples of Christ and the Kingdom, By Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D., Pastor Central Church of Disciples, New York City . . . 13

From Uniformity Through Diversities to Comprehension, By Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., New Haven, Connecticut 9

Half-Century Experiment in Interdenominational Coöperation and Its Failure, A, By Miss Julia Pettee, New York City 30

Moral Test for Future Life, The, By Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., Pastor Crowstone Congregational Church, Westcliff-on-Sea, England 217

Problem of Christian Union, The, By Rev. F. D. Kershner, LL.D., Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa 89

Reply by the Most Rev. Nikolaos, Metropolitan of Nubia, to Dr. Lhamon (Translated by Ralph W. Brown) 254

Some Thoughts from Main Street Concerning Church Union, By Rev. Fred Smith, Pastor Pilgrim Congregational Church, Carthage, S. D. 138

Some Thoughts on Unity—A Statement by Professor Francis J. Hall, D.D., General Theological Seminary, New York City . . . 115

Union of the Churches, The, By Demetrios Simou Balanos (Translated from *Anaplasis,* Athens, by Ralph W. Brown) 100
Unity at Work in Porto Rico, By Rev. J. D. Montgomery, Bayamon, Porto Rico 280
Unity—Its Ideal and Necessity, By Rev. George Woolsey Hodge, D.D., Former Secretary Church Unity Society (Episcopal), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 180
Unity—Its Methods and Objections, By Rev. George Woolsey Hodge, D.D. 261
Unity, Not Uniformity, By Rev. Principal Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., New College, London, England 249

What People and Papers are Saying About Unity. . . 66, 145, 224, 300
Letter to the Editor 155
Book Reviews 77, 157, 239, 315

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CB

CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1922-1923

DATE	ISSUED TO